# Daily Report
## Soviet Union

*FBIS-SOV-87-239* *14 December 1987*

CONTENTS

**COMMUNIST RELATIONS**

Reportage on Gorbachev Berlin Pact Meeting ..... 1
Arrival; Met by Honecker ..... 1
Participants Listed *[PRAVDA 12 Dec]* ..... 1
Inspection Accord Reported ..... 2
Text of Inspection Accord *[NEUES DEUTSCHLAND 12-13 Dec]* ..... 2
Honecker, Gorbachev Speak ..... 6
Gorbachev Luncheon Toast *[PRAVDA 12 Dec]* ..... 7
Departure From Berlin ..... 8
Arrival in Moscow ..... 8
Observer Comments on Meetings *[A. Kondrashov]* ..... 8
Party Research Representatives Meet in Moscow ..... 9

**WORLDWIDE ISSUES**

Gremitskikh News Conference on INF Treaty ..... 10
TASS Notes NATO Communique on INF Treaty ..... 10
NATO's Lord Carrington Discusses INF Treaty ..... 10
Pozner on INF Treaty, Emigration, Afghanistan *[BBC]* ..... 11
'Top Priority' Program on Summit Meeting *[P. Kuznetsov, R. Bogdanov, S. Plekhanov]* ..... 13
Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' *[I. Charikov, V. Sedykh, V. Tsoppi]* ..... 17
Smirnov, Medvedev At Great October Conference ..... 22
Medvedev Addresses Session ..... 22

**REAGAN-GORBACHEV SUMMIT**

Reagan Postsummit Comments, Observations ..... 24
Postsummit TV Address *[PRAVDA 12 Dec]* ..... 24
Cited on SDI Research *[PRAVDA 13 Dec]* ..... 24
12 Dec Address to Nation ..... 24
Ratification Meetings Begin ..... 25
U.S. Views on Treaty, Summit Surveyed ..... 25
Congressional Backing Noted ..... 25
U.S. Conservatives Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 11 Dec]* ..... 25
U.S. Public Reaction Cited *[Kobysh, Dunayev]* ..... 27
Further Soviet Reportage, Comment on Summit ..... 27
Summit 'First Real Step' *[PRAVDA 11 Dec]* ..... 27
Morozov on 'Balance of Interests' *[TRUD 11 Dec]* ..... 29
Gontar Cited on Implementation ..... 29
Glazunov on Treaty, Future ..... 31
'Danger' of Nonratification *[Pozner, Zakharov, Lyubimov, Listev]* ..... 31
Ovchinnikov: 'Watershed' *[PRAVDA 14 Dec]* ..... 33
Rostov on Talks, Opposition ..... 35
Moscow TV Rounds Up Reactions ..... 35
Further on Reaction to Summit ..... 36

**INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS**

**United States & Canada**

U.S., USSR Sign Space Cooperation Protocol ..... 38
Reagan Signs Budget for U.S. 'Secret Services' ..... 38
Moscow TV Carries Documentary on Peace Group ..... 38

Briefs ..... 40
150 Million View Telebridge ..... 40

**China**

Huang Hua Hails Signing of INF Treaty ..... 40
PRC Protests to U.S. on Tibet Amendment ..... 40
RENMIN RIBAO Denounces U.S. 'Interference' on Tibet ..... 40
Increasing Trade Volume With Heilongjiang ..... 40

**Northeast Asia**

Japanese Leaders Hail Missile Treaty, Summit *[IZVESTIYA 11 Dec]* ..... 41
No Revision of Defense Policy ..... 41
USSR, Japan Fail To Agree in Fishery Talks *[KYODO]* ..... 41
Japan To Increase Military Base Expenditure ..... 42
ROK Concerned About Military Role in Elections ..... 42
DPRK Concludes Demobilization of Troops ..... 42

**Southeast Asia & Pacific**

ASEAN Meeting Opens in Manila ..... 43
Gorbachev Sends Greetings ..... 43
Australian Foreign Minister Leaves Moscow ..... 44
TASS, Australian News Agency Sign Agreement *[IZVESTIYA 9 Dec]* ..... 44
Moscow Ceremony Marks Lao National Holiday *[PRAVDA 2 Dec]* ..... 44
Movie Industry Cooperation With Laos Planned *[IZVESTIYA 2 Dec]* ..... 44
Briefs ..... 44
Cultural Cooperation With Laos ..... 44

**Near East & South Asia**

Israel Pursuing 'Reckless Military Ventures' *[G. Vasilyev]* ..... 45
Soviet-Egyptian Friendship Society Holds Meeting ..... 45
Libya Protests French Decision on Arms for Chad ..... 45
PDRY Court Sentences Former President To Death ..... 45
YAR Deputy Premier Meets Soviet Delegation ..... 46
Jordanian King Praises Ties With Soviet Union ..... 46
DRA's Najibullah Interviewed on D.C. Summit ..... 46

**Sub-Saharan Africa**

Zimbabwe's Mugabe Congratulates Summit Leaders ..... 47
CPSU Greets Angolan Party on 10th Anniversary *[PRAVDA 10 Dec]* ..... 47
Supreme Soviet Delegation Leaves for Zambia *[IZVESTIYA 8 Dec]* ..... 47
Meets ANC's Alfred Nzo ..... 47
Kaunda Receives Delegation ..... 48
Demichev Receives Outgoing Ghanaian Ambassador ..... 48
Reznikov, CPSU Delegation Depart for Ghana *[PRAVDA 8 Dec]* ..... 48
Hold Talks With PNDC's Tsikata ..... 48

**East Europe**

CSSR's Chnoupek Welcomes Treaty Signing ..... 49
Bulgaria's Mladenov Comments on INF Treaty *[PRAVDA 11 Dec]* ..... 49
Poland's Urban Interviewed on Referendum ..... 50
Polish Consular Agency Opened in Lvov *[Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY 2 Dec]* ..... 51

**West Europe**

French Reaction to Missile Treaty Mixed *[IZVESTIYA 11 Dec]* ..... 52
Marchais on French Reaction ..... 53
Karpov in FRG Briefs Genscher on Summit ..... 53

Parents To Visit Rust in Moscow Jail *[DPA]* ..... 53
Italian CP Leader Supports INF Treaty ..... 53
Gorbachev's Book Published in Greece ..... 54
Soviet Defects Across Norwegian Border ..... 54
'Witch-Hunt' Against Turkish Communists Hit *[PRAVDA 11 Dec]* ..... 54

### Latin America & Caribbean

CIA Involvement in Aid for Contras Reported ..... 55
Nicaragua's Ortega Cited on Opposition Parties ..... 55
Nicaragua's H. Ortega Cited on Peace Efforts ..... 56
Obukhov Holds Talks With Fidel Castro ..... 56
Mexican Socialist Party Congress Ends ..... 56

## NATIONAL AFFAIRS

### Political & Social

Construction Industry Work Criticized *[PRAVDA 5 Dec]* ..... 57
New Kind of Enthusiasm Seen in CPSU Cadres *[PRAVDA 29 Nov]* ..... 57
Primary Organizations' Role To Lead Reform *[PRAVDA 1 dec]* ..... 59
Afanasyev Discusses Democracy, Glasnost *[PRAVDA 14 Dec]* ..... 60
Saratov Obkom Discusses Restructuring *[PRAVDA 24 Nov]* ..... 63
Kirghiz CP Plenum Discusses Admissions Policy *[PRAVDA 5 Dec]* ..... 66
Ukrainian Trade Union Council Holds Plenum *[RADYANSKA UKRAINA 26 Nov]* ..... 66
Major Fight in Taganrog Park Reported *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 27 Nov]* ..... 66
Detective Cited on Prostitution Problem *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 4 Dec]* ..... 66
New Service To Cover Moscow Happenings *[IZVESTIYA 5 Dec]* ..... 67
Soviet Law Court Anniversary Commemorated *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 5 Dec]* ..... 67
RSFSR Deputy Premier Karpova Retires *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 9 dec]* ..... 67
World Muslim Congress Visit Ends ..... 67
Dissidents Prevented From Attending Seminar *[AFP]* ..... 68
Meet in Private Apartment *[AFP]* ..... 68
Book on Position of Orthodox Church Reviewed *[PRAVDA 7 Dec]* ..... 69
Movie on Soviet History 'More Light' Reviewed *[MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 21 Nov]* ..... 70
Yevtushenko Explains Silence on Afghanistan *[Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER 26 Nov]* ..... 71

### Agricultural

Livestock Farmers Near to Fulfilling Plan ..... 71
Estonian Agro-Industry To Initiate Autonomy ..... 72
Media Report 2-11 December Developments ..... 72
Briefs: ..... 73
Snow Hampers Cotton Harvest ..... 73

### Scientific

'Cosmos-1900' Satellite Launched 12 Dec ..... 73
Mir 'Proceeding Normally'; Cosmonauts 'Well' ..... 73
Leaders Sign Polar Explorer's Obituary *[IZVESTIYA 7 Dec]* ..... 74

### Military

Yazov on INF Treaty, Boosting Combat Readiness *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Dec]* ..... 74
Higher Military Construction Schools Viewed ..... 75

## Reportage on Gorbachev Berlin Pact Meeting

### Arrival; Met by Honecker

*LD112221 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 11 Dec 87*

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Today Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev arrived in Berlin to take part in a meeting of leading figures of the Warsaw Pact member states. Berlin's Schoenefeld Airport.

[Begin Gorbachev recording] In the GDR, things are in good order: The weather is fine. [end recording]

[Announcer] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev was met by Erich Honecker and other officials.

Comrade Gorbachev was warmly welcomed by the Berlin population.

[Begin recording] [Gorbachev] I am glad to see you are so well.

[Unidentified woman] Same here.

[Gorbachev] In such a good mood.

[Unidentified woman] Thank you.

[Gorbachev] Thank you for coming to meet me.

[Unidentified man in German] Thank you for the good work. [Gorbachev and others laugh] [end recording]

### Participants Listed

*PM141121 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Dec 87 Second Edition p 1*

[Unattributed report under the headline "Meeting of Warsaw Pact State Leaders"]

[Text] By mutual agreement, a meeting took place in Berlin on 11 December of the general and first secretaries of the central committees of the fraternal parties of the Warsaw Pact member states.

Taking part in the meeting were: Todor Zhivkov, Bulgarian Communist Party Central Committee general secretary, chairman of the Bulgarian Council of State; Janos Kadar, general secretary of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party; Erich Honecker, general secretary of the SED Central Committee, chairman of the GDR Council of State; Wojciech Jaruzelski, first secretary of the PZPR, chairman of the Polish Council of State; as a plenipotentiary representative of Nicolae Ceausescu, the Romanian Communist Party secretary general and president of Romania, Ioan Totu, candidate member of the Political Executive Committee of the Romanian Communist Party, minister of foreign affairs of the Socialist Republic of Romania; Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Gustav Husak, general secretary of the Czechoslovakian Communist Party Central Committee and president of the CSSR.

Also taking part in the meeting were, from the Bulgarian Peoples Republic, Dzhurov, Politburo member of the BCP Central Committee, Bulgarian minister of defense; Mladenov, member of the Politburo of the BCP Central Committee, minister of foreign affairs.

From the Hungarian Peoples Republic, Varkonyi, member of the MSZMP Central Committee, Hungarian minister of foreign affairs; Karpati, member of the MSZMP Central Committee and Hungarian minister of defense.

From the GDR, Stoph, member of the SED Central Committee Politburo, chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers; Kessler, member of the SED Central Committee Politburo, GDR minister of national defense; Fischer, member of the SED Central Committee, GDR minister of foreign affairs.

From the Polish Peoples Republic, Orzechowski, member of the PZPR Central Committee Politburo and minister of foreign affairs; Siwicki, member of the PZPR Politburo and minister of national defense of the Polish Peoples Republic.

From the Socialist Republic of Romania, Milea, candidate member of the Political Executive Committee of the Romanian Communist Party Central Committee, minister of national defense of the Socialist Republic of Romania.

From the USSR, Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, USSR minister of foreign affairs; Yakovlev, Politburo member, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Yazov, candidate member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR minister of defense; Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Medvedev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

From the CSSR, Chnoupek, member of the CPCZ Central Committee, CSSR minister of foreign affairs; Rusov, member of the CPCZ Central Committee, first deputy minister of national defense of the CSSR.

Also taking part in the meeting was Marshal of the Soviet Union Kulikov, commander in chief of the Joint Armed Forces of the Warsaw Pact member states.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev informed the meeting's participants in detail about his visit to the United States, and about the progress and results of his talks with President Ronald Reagan.

The leaders of the allied states fully supported and highly appraised the results of the talks in Washington. A step of historical proportions had been made and is already exerting a beneficial influence on the world's political climate, increasing mutual trust between states, and strengthening hope for the victory of realism and reason in the current complicated, contradictory, but interdependent world.

The participants in the meeting expressed to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev profound gratitude for the consistent and energetic efforts by the Soviet Union, efforts which had led to the first real results in the cause of nuclear disarmament and had become a testimony to the new political thinking's effectiveness. It was stressed with satisfaction that this is an expression of the general peaceloving course of the Warsaw Pact member states, and of the initiatives and actions of the socialist countries, which invariably advocate reductions in the level of confrontation and supports moving on to mutually beneficial cooperation in world affairs.

The constructive positions of the GDR and the CSSR, which had expressed readiness to facilitate implementation of the tenets of the Washington treaty convening these states, were noted.

The Soviet-U.S. Treaty on Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles meets the interests of all and increases the level of security in Europe, Asia, and beyond. The actions of many states, including nonaligned states, the actions by antiwar movements, and of peaceloving forces of all continents facilitated its attainment.

In the common view of the meeting's participants, it is of cardinal significance that an agreement in principle between the USSR and the United States to halve the strategic offensive weapons of both sides with the strict observance of the ABM Treaty was elaborated at the talks in Washington. The conclusion of such an agreement—and this is possible even in the near future—would be a fundamental improvement in the cause of disarmament and creation of a nuclear-free and nonviolent world.

The accords that were achieved, it was noted at the meeting, strengthen prerequisites for progress in other directions too, leading to the curtailment of the arms race—first of all in prohibiting and eliminating chemical weapons, ending nuclear tests, and reducing the armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals.

The readiness of the allied socialist states was affirmed to adhere to the limits of sufficiency necessary for defense, to resolve the problem of asymmetries and imbalances in separate kinds of weapons through reductions by whoever is ahead. At the same time, concern was expressed at the intentions of certain NATO circles to "compensate" for the elimination of two classes of nuclear weapons on the continent by stepping up and modernizing other forms of armaments.

The meeting's participants expressed the determination of the Warsaw Pact countries to continue to contribute to the cause of strengthening peace, disarmament, to create a comprehensive system of international security, and to solve other complex global and regional problems. To this end, they will strive for close interaction with all forces that advocate the preservation and strengthening of peace, so that war is forever excluded from the life of humanity.

The ministers of foreign affairs of the USSR, the GDR, and the CSSR signed an agreement between the USSR, the GDR, and the CSSR on inspections [inspektsiya] relating to the USSR-U.S. Treaty on Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles.

The meeting in the GDR capital was held in an atmosphere, traditional in the relations between the allied socialist states, of fraternal friendship and comradely cooperation.

## Inspection Accord Reported

*LD111729 Moscow TASS in English 1649 GMT 11 Dec 87*

[Text] Berlin December 11 TASS—The ministers of foreign affairs of the USSR, the GDR and the CSSR attending the meeting of the leading figures of the Warsaw treaty member-states today signed an agreement between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the German Democratic Republic and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic on the inspections to be conducted in conjunction with the treaty between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America on the elimination of their intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles.

## Text of Inspection Accord

*AU141345 East Berlin NEUES DEUTSCHLAND in German 12-13 Dec 87 p 4*

[Text of "Agreement Between the GDR, the USSR, and the CSSR on Inspections in Connection With the Treaty Between the USSR and the United States of America on the Elimination of their Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles"]

The GDR, the USSR, and the CSSR, guided by the objectives and principles of the Warsaw Pact on Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance of 14 May 1955 and in particular its Article 2, have agreed as follows:

Article I [subhead]

1. The GDR, the USSR, and the CSSR agree that the inspection work in connection with Article XI of the treaty signed between the USSR and the United States in Washington on 8 December 1987 on the elimination of their missiles of medium and shsorter range may be carried out on the territory of the GDR and will take place in accordance with the stipulations of the protocol on inspections in connection with the treaty between the USSR and the United States on the elimination of their missiles of medium and shorter range.

2. The GDR and the CSSR, henceforth called the deployment states, declare their consent tro contribute on their territories toward the realization of the USSR's obligations resulting from the treaty, including the pertinent protocol on inspections, in keeping with this agreement.

3. Nothing in this agreement touches on the sovereign right of the deployment states to apply their laws and other legal provisions vis-a-vis persons staying on their respective territories in connection with the carrying out of the inspection work in conformity with the protocol on inspections without prejudice to any privileges and immunities granted to them.

4. The deployment states accept with this agreement no obligations of any kind and grant no rights whatever that result from the treaty or protocol on inspections, except those that are directly assumed or granted commensurate with this agreement.

5. Should a deployment state have reason to assume that its rights and interests are being jeopardized as a result of the implementation of inspection work on its territory, the USSR, at its request, will take the requisite measures for the protection of such rights and interests.

Article II [subhead]

Definitions [subhead]

For the purposes of this agreement the following definitions shall apply:

1. "Treaty"—the treaty between the USSR and the United States on the elimination of their missiles of medium and shorter range.

2. "Protocol on Inspections"—the protocol between the USSR and the United States on inspections in connection with the treaty on the elimination of their medium- and shorter-range missiles.

3. "Inspected side"—the USSR.

4. "Inspecting side"—the United States.

5. "Inspection group""—the inspectors who have been assigned to the concrete inspection by the inspecting side.

6. "Inspector"—a person who has been appointed for the implementation of the inspections by the United States and has been admitted to the list of inspectors of the United States in line with the stipulations of Section 3 of the protocol on inspections.

7. "Inspection site"—the area, the point or object where the inspection is carried out.

8. "Duration of inspection"—the period of time from the arrival of the inspection group at the inspection site to the departure from the inspection site without the time spent on all the pre- and post-inspection procedures.

9. "Point of entry"

—For the GDR:

Leipzig (Schkeuditz) airport;

—For the CSSR:

Prague (Ruzyne) airport.

10. "Length of stay in country"—the period of time from the arrival of the inspection group at the entry point to the time when it leaves the country at the point of entry.

11. "Accompanying persons within the country"—persons who have been designated by the inspected side and, if necessary, accompany the inspectors and members of the air crew and give them support for the entire stay in the country.

12. "Member of the air crew"—a person who carries out tasks in connection with servicing the aircraft and has been included in the list of members of the air crew of the inspecting side.

Article III [subhead]

Notifications [subhead]

1. After this agreement has come into force, the inspected side and each of the deployment states shall establish a channel of communications to convey or receive notifications of inspections at any time and confirm their receipt.

2. Immediately after receiving a notification from the inspecting side of their intention to carry out an inspection on the territory of the respective deployment state, the inspected side shall notify the relevant authority of that state by announcing the date and expected time of arrival of the inspection group at the point of entry and the names of the members of the inspection group and the members of the air crew. After receipt from the inspecting side of the flight schedule from the last airport prior to entering the airspace of the state in whose frontiers the site of inspection is located, to the point of

entry, the inspected side shall refer this flight schedule to the relevant authority of that state for endorsement. The deployment state on whose territory the inspection is carried out shall notify the inspected side at least 4 hours prior to the planned departure time of the inspection group about the confirmation of the plan.

3. On receipt of the announcement of the definite inspection site from the head of the inspection group, the inspected side shall immediately inform the relevant authorities of the deployment state of this by announcing the designation of the inspection site and its geographic coordinates.

4. The deployment state may change the point of entry stipulated in Article ii.9 of this agreement. In this case, the deployment state shall inform the inspected side about such an alteration, which shall for its part notify the inspecting side of this. A change in relation to the point of entry shall come into force after 5 months of the inspecting side receiving such a notification.

Article IV [subhead]

Measures Prior to an Inspection [subhead]

1. The inspected side conveys to the deployment states advance lists of the inspectors and members of the aircrews as handed over by the inspecting side, and will inform them at once of any change to these lists proposed by the inspecting side. The deployment states will inform the inspected side of its agreement concerning the acceptance of inspectors and members of the aircrews in the respective lists within 15 days after receipt of the advance lists and 7 days after receipt of a proposed changed.

2. Within 25 days after receipt of the advance lists of inspectors and members of the aircrews or any subsequent changes to these lists, the deployment state will issue for every person for whom approval was given, a visa and, if required, other documents necessary for the entry of each inspector or aircrew member to its territory and that permit them to stay there to carry out the inspection work according to the stipulations of the Protocol on Inspections. Such visas and documents shall be issued for a period of at least 24 months.

Should a person be deleted from the lists of inspectors and aircrew members for reasons listed under Section III, Point 7 of the Protocol on Inspections, the inspected side will inform the deployment state about this immediately. The latter will cancel the visa and other documents which, according to the stipulations of this agreement, were issued for the person concerned.

3. Within 25 days after the coming into force of this agreement, the deployment state will convey to the inspected side the permanent diplomatic authorization flight numbers for the aircraft of the inspecting side that carry the inspectors and the equipment necessary for carrying out the inspection on its territory. In this, the deployment state will inform the inspected side about the agreed-upon international flight routes leading to the point of entry on its territory.

4. The deployment state will grant to the inspectors and members of the air crew, for the effective execution of their functions throughout their stay on its territory, privileges and immunities as listed in the attachment to this agreement. Such privileges and immunities are granted with the understanding that the inspectors and aircrew members will respect, without prejudice to their privileges and immunities, the laws and other legal directions of the deployment state and will not interfere in its internal affairs. In case the inspecting side refuses to meet its obligation under Section III Point 7 of the Protocol on Inspections to withdraw an inspector or member of the air crew should the person concerned violate the conditions governing the execution of the inspection or commit a punishable act, this inspector or air crew member may be refused the further recognition of his right to such privileges and immunities.

5. The deployment state will exempt the equipment and materials imported by the inspecting side for carrying out the inspection from customs duties.

6. The representatives of the deployment state,in which the inspection is carried out, have the right together with the inspected side to make a check of the equipment and materials brought in by the inspecting side to establish that these objects cannot be used for carrying out functions that have nothing to do with the inspections carried out in agreement with the Protocol on Inspections. If the deployment state objects to the importation of some equipment or materials, the inspected side will ensure their removal from the territory of the deployment state by the first aircraft available to the inspecting side.

Article V [subhead]

Carrying Out of the Inspections [subhead]

1. After the inspected side, in agreement with Article III Paragraph 3 of this agreement, has announced the inspection site, the deployment state takes the necessary measures to grant the inspecting side all permits and to provide support so that the inspection group can reach the inspection site without delay and can arrive there not later than 9 hours after the announcement of the inspection site by the inspecting side. The inspected side and the deployment state, in which the inspection site is situated, hold consultations on the transportation means to be used. The deployment state has the right to lay down the connecting route between the point of entry and the inspection site.

2. The deployment state provides the inspected side, where necessary, support in the provision of a telephone link between the inspectors and the embassy of the inspecting side.

3. The inspected side and the deployment state, on whose territory the inspection site is situated, hold consultations on the protection, maintenance, and refueling of the aircraft of the inspecting side and on the provision of accommodation, catering, and services for the inspectors and members of the aircraft crew at the point of entry and the inspection site. The costs for all services requested by the inspecting side and provided by the deployment state are borne by the inspected side.

4. If the inspecting side requests the original period of the inspection to be extended from 24 hours by a period that must not exceed 8 hours, the inspected side notifies the deployment state immediately about this extension.

Article VI [subhead]

Consultations [subhead]

1. Within 5 days after the coming into force of this agreement, the inspected side and the deployment state hold discussions to coordinate the inspection activity envisaged in Article XI of the treaty, the Protocol on Inspections, and the present agreement.

2. Consultations between the inspected side and the deployment state to discuss questions relating to the implementation of the present agreement will be held within 5 days, after the inspected side or the deployment state requests the holding of such consultations.

3. In case a question arises that, in the opinion of the deployment state, requires immediate clarification, the deployment state can establish contact with the organ of the inspected side that deals with questions concerning the announcement of inspections. The inspected side immediately confirms the receipt of the request and without delay examines the question raised.

4. If the deployment state establishes that an inspector or a member of the air crew has violated the conditions regulating the conduct of inspections, or has committed a punishable act on its territory, the deployment state notifies the inspected side, which informs the inspecting side that it is necessary to withdraw this person from the territory of the deployment state.

5. The inspected side shall inform the deployment state on whose territory the inspection took place about the conclusion of the inspection and shall provide, at the request of the deployment state, explanations concerning the inspection carried out.

6. If a change is proposed to Article XI of the treaty or the protocol on inspections that directly affects the rights, interests, or obligations of the deployment state, the inspected side shall not approve that change without the agreement of the deployment states.

Article VII [subhead]

Period of Validity of the Agreement [subhead]

This agreement requires endorsement by the Governments of the GDR, the USSR, and the CSSR in accordance with the constitutional rules of procedure of those states. On conclusion of this procedure it shall come into force simultaneously with the treaty, and remains in force as long as inspections in accordance with the treaty and the Protocol on Inspections are carried out on the territory of the deployment states.

Drawn up in Berlin on the 11 December 1987 in three copies, each in the German, Russian, and Czech language, whereby all texts are equally binding.

For the GDR For the USSR For the CSSR

Oskar Fischer Eduard Shevardnadze Bohuslav Chnoupek

Annex [subhead]

Stipulations on the Privileges and Immunities of the Inspectors and members of the Aircrew [subhead]

For the effective discharge of their functions, the inspectors and members of the aircrews shall, for the purpose of the implementation of the treaty and not their personal interests, be granted the privileges and immunities set out in this annex. The privileges and immunities shall be granted for the entire duration of stay on the territory of the deployment state in which the inspection takes place.

1. The inspectors and members of the aircrew shall enjoy the same immunity as diplomats under Article 29 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 18 April 1961.

2. The papers and correspondence of the inspectors and members of an aircrew enjoy immunity as provided by Article 30 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations. The aircraft of the inspection group likewise has immunity.

3. The inspectors and aircrew enjoy the immunities that diplomats are granted under Article 31, Paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations.

The inspecting side may dispense with the legal immunity of an inspector or member of the aircrew if, in its judgment, the immunity hinders the administration of justice and if it can be renounced without impairing the implementation of the treaty stipulations.

The renunciation must always be clearly stated.

4. The inspectors and aircrew members of the inspecting side are permitted to bring into the territory of the deployment state in which the inspection site is located

such goods as are destined for personal use without incurring customs duties or related duties, with the exception of goods the import or export of which is forbidden by legal provisions or is subject to quarantine laws.

5. An inspector or air crew member may not engage in professional or commercial activity for the purpose of gaining personal advantage on the territory of the inspected side or the deployment states.

6. Moving about and trips by the inspectors and aircrew members may, if necessary, take place with the participation of persons who also accompany them within the country, as provided for by the protocol on inspections.

7. If the deployment state is of the opinion that a misuse of the privileges and immunities set out in this annex has taken place, consultations shall be conducted between it and the inspected side to establish whether such a misuse has taken place and, should this be established, to prevent a repetition of such misuse.

## Honecker, Gorbachev Speak

*LD112259 Moscow TASS in English 2150 GMT 11 Dec 87*

[Quotation marks as received]

[Text] Berlin December 11 TASS—Erich Honecker, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and chairman of the State Council of the German Democratic Republic, hosted a dinner at the State Council today in honour of the Warsaw treaty leaders who attended a meeting here.

Addressing the audience, he said, in part:

"The Soviet-American Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles is an historic landmark along the road leading to a nuclear-free world.

It is a first practical conclusion from the premise that it is necessary to save mankind from nuclear catastrophe. The entire world welcomed the first treaty on disarmament, concluded in the nuclear age, and other measures intended for the future, received them with relief and not in the least turn with hope.

This is clear because the road to stability and security lies not through ever new arms, but through sensible political decisions. This treaty is a victory that the world needs so much, it is not a victory achieved with the help of weapons, but a victory over weapons, a victory of reason and realism.

Peace and disarmament are our credo. Six months ago our allied socialist nations expressed—here, in Berlin—their will to make a nuclear-weapon free world a reality, so that no type of weapons be bypassed in the process of disarmament—and all that in conditions of comprehensive verification and inspection.

We want to follow that path in the future as well. We will unswervingly adhere to this goal. This is evidenced, above all, by the results of our meeting which give a fresh impetus to our community, to our common striving to build a lasting peace."

"It is no exaggeration to say," Mikhail Gorbachev said in his remarks, "that the signing of the first treaty eliminating two classes of nuclear weapons is an event of historic, decisive dimension.

It took the interaction of many various factors to resolve that complex task. It is clear that this would have been impossible had the socialist countries not acted in agreement, had they not conducted persistent and consistent struggle for disarmament, had they not advanced an integral programme of measures in that direction, including those that have now been implemented.

The Washington treaty could justly be regarded in two ways: as completion of a seven-year-long political and diplomatic marathon and as a first act of the real curbing of the arms race, as the end of one stage in the development of international relations and a prologues to another.

This new stage begins in favourable conditions. I mean advancement on the issue of the 50-per cent reduction of strategic offensive arms. Understanding also was reached that it is necessary to press without delay for the solution of other topical issues—elimination of chemical weapons, cessation of nuclear testing, reduction of conventional arms and armed forces.

The search for settling regional conflicts, serious, responsible discussion of humanitarian issues, including human rights, will be continued.

Of course, it would be wrong to believe that all that is easy to acheve, that the train of disarmament, picking speed, will rush on on its own. We are realists. We realize full well how much effort will be required so that the first step be followed by other, far more important and big steps.

In what concerns us, the peoples can be rest assured, the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries will do everything so that the treaty signed in Washington be followed by other agreements, so that the arsenals of deadly weapons be reduced till they cease to threaten life of the human race.

There is one more important circumstance to which I'd like to draw your attention. Changes for the better that have begun in the international arena are inseparably linked with the great work started in the fraternal countries on perfecting and renovating socialism.

In effect, it is hard to say where the internal aspect of these processes ends and the external one begins. Acceleration of our countries' economic development, democratization and greater openness change the very face of socialism, delete propaganda cliches that have been formed in the West over the decades, and expand the opportunities for understanding between peoples, for fruitful cooperation in the interests of peace and progress."

### Gorbachev Luncheon Toast

*LD141103 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Dec 87 Second Edition p 2*

["Dinner at the State Council"—PRAVDA general headline]

[Text] Berlin, 11 Dec (TASS)—Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, made the following toast at the dinner:

Dear Comrades and Friends, allow me first of all to express my deep satisfaction that we have been able to meet here in Berlin fresh in the footsteps of the Soviet-U.S. negotiations at the highest level, that we have had the opportunity to exchange opinions, and that we are in agreement in our assessment of the significance of this event for the fate of the world. Comrade Erich Honecker has just expressed this very well and all comrades have spoken of this during our meeting. It is certainly no exaggeration to say that the signing of the first treaty, which scraps two classes of nuclear weapons, represents an event of historic dimensions, a turning point.

A combination of many different factors was necessary in order to solve this extremely complicated task. It is clear that this would not have been possible if the socialist countries had not acted in a joint, coordinated, and cohesive way, if they had not conducted a persistent and consistent struggle for disarmament, and if they had not submitted a united program of measures in this direction, including those that it has now been possible to realize.

Comrade Erich Honecker expressed this quite correctly. In the negotiations with President Reagan, the Soviet delegation acted on the basis of a kind of mandate that it received from its friends and allies. This lent our position additional weight and at the same time increased our feeling of responsibility for the outcome of these negotiations. For that reason, we can say with good reason that the success is a result of our common efforts.

I would like to stress here in particular the contribution of the leaderships of the GDR and Czechoslovakia, whose constructive position has contributed toward operatively coordinating specific questions connected with the realization of a treaty on the territory of these countries.

The results of the meeting in Washington are now being discussed throughout the world in a very lively way. It is clear, even without opinion polls, that almost no event since World War II has unleashed such an interested and benevolent echo. In addition, it has awakened such great hopes for the future.

One can, with complete justification, regard the Washington treaty in two respects. On the one hand as the conclusion of a 7-year political and diplomatic marathon and as the first act of a genuine curbing of the arms race. As the end of a stage in the development of international relations and as the prologue to a new stage.

This new stage begins under favorable conditions. I mean the advance in the question of a 50% reduction in strategic offensive weapons. We have reached an understanding that it is also necessary to seek solutions without delay to other topical problems: for the elimination of chemical weapons; for an end to nuclear weapon tests; for a reduction in conventional weapons and armed forces. The search for settlements to regional conflicts will be continued. Humanitarian questions will be discussed in a serious and responsible atmosphere, including problems faced by the individual.

Of course, it would not be correct to assume that all this is possible without effort and that the course of disarmament now storms ahead at an ever-increasing speed of its own accord. We are realists, and we understand very well how much effort is still necessary in order to ensure that the first step is followed by further, even more important, and greater steps.

As far as we are concerned, the peoples can be certain that the Soviet Union and the socialist countries will do everything to ensure that the treaty that has just been signed in Washington is followed by new agreements, so that the arsenals of deadly weapons will be further emptied until they no longer represent a danger to the existence of mankind.

I would like to draw your attention to a further important circumstance. The changes for the better that have begun in the international arena are indivisably linked with the great work, with the extensive work in the fraternal countries to improve and renew socialism. In essence, it is difficult to say where the internal aspect of these processes will end and the external begins. The acceleration of the economic development of our countries, the democratization and greater openness are changing the face of socialism, overcoming propaganda cliches that have formed in the West over decades, and are expanding the opportunities for international understanding, for a fruitful cooperation in the interest of peace and progress.

We Soviet Communists regard our restructuring and the consolidation of peaceful coexistence as two component parts of one policy directed at peace, at free work, at justice, and at the well-being of the people.

Comrades, at this time people throughout the world are preparing to bid farewell to the ending year and to welcome a new year, the year 1988. The way man is, everyone likes to believe that the new year will be better than the previous one. The treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles is a good and a great present for the peoples to mark the new year.

Much depends on the activity of our parties, on the policy of our states as to whether the hopes of many millions of people in the world will be fulfilled. We will work persistently for this goal.

Allow me, in conclusion, cordially to thank the German comrades for their hospitality.

On behalf of our party and of the Soviet people, I would like to convey our best wishes to the Communists and the working people of all socialist fraternal countries.

### Departure From Berlin

*LD111724 Moscow TASS in English 1713 GMT 11 Dec 87*

[Text] Berlin December 11 TASS—General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev left Berlin today. He attended the meeting of leading figures of the Warsaw treaty member states.

At the airport he was seen off by General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, Chairman of the Council of State of the GDR Erich Honecker, other officials.

### Arrival in Moscow

*LD112100 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 11 Dec 87*

[From the "Vremya" newscast; announcer-read report over video]

[Text] This evening Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, having completed his official visit to the United States, returned to Moscow.

On his way to Moscow, Comrade Gorbachev took part in the Berlin meeting of leading figures of the Warsaw Pact participant states.

Comrades Shevardnadze, Yakovlev, Yazov, Dobrynin, Medvedev; Comrade Kamentsev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; Marshal of the Soviet Union Comrade Akhromeyev, first deputy USSR minister of defense; and Comrade Chernyayev, aide to the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, returned together with the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

At Vnukovo Airport, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev was met by Comrades Vorotnikov, Gromyko, Zaykov, Ligachev, Ryzhkov, Slyunkov, Solomentsev, Cherbrikov, Demichev, Dolgikh, Talyzin, Biryukova, Lukyanov, Razumovskiy, Kapitonov, and other comrades. [video shows Gorbachev being welcomed by comrades in following order: Gromyko, Ryzhkov, Ligachev; brief distant shot of group; Vorotnikov, Chebrikov, Lukyanov, Solomentsev, Talyzin, Dolgikh, Demichev, Kapitonov]

Among the welcoming party were Koenig, the GDR ambassador to the Soviet Union; Cartledge, the ambassador of Great Britain to the USSR; and Joyce, the U.S. charge d'affaires ad interim to the USSR.

### Observer Comments on Meetings

*LD122304 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1552 GMT 12 Dec 87*

[Text] Moscow, 12 Dec (TASS)—TASS Observer Aleksandr Kondrashov writes:

The world public has received the Berlin meeting of leaders of the Warsaw Pact member states as an event inseparably linked with the Soviet-U.S. summit dialogue. A good tradition of meetings of the heads of the allied socialist countries following a dialogue between the leaders of East and West has already formed in recent times. The examples of the Prague meeting after Geneva and the November meeting in Moscow after Reykjavik confirm this, showing at the same time what great importance the Soviet Union attaches to consultations with fraternal countries and to working out a united, coordinated policy of the socialist community in solving global issues of world politics.

But the meeting in Berlin was particularly significant. It became not only the manifestation of a tradition or fraternal community in international affairs but also the summing up of vigorous and innovative efforts in the common struggle for practical changes in the cause of disarmament. The Soviet-U.S. agreement on the liquidation of shorter- and medium-range missiles, which has been seen by all mankind as a historic step toward a nuclear-free and secure world, can be justly called the result of joint efforts of fraternal socialist countries.

We all remember very well how many constructive initiatives the countries of the socialist community put forward with the aim of eliminating lethal first-strike weapons in Europe. We remember how powerfully sounded the voice of the public in fraternal countries against the "Pershing" and cruise missiles stationed near their borders! All those efforts were not in vain. They gradually cleared the way to the agreement signed the other day in Washington.

The USSR allies did particularly a lot on the last stretch of the road to the historical agreement. Let us recall the post-Reykjavik developments: the far-reaching compromise proposals by the USSR on separating the issue of shorter-range missiles from the whole package of nuclear disarmament problems, on elimination of 100 missiles in the Asian part of the USSR, and on the "global double-zero." All this found support and understanding not only among USSR allies or people of goodwill throughout the world and responsible political figures in the West. Positive changes occurred in the position of the U.S. Administration itself. A problem arose from the most unexpected side—from that of U.S. European NATO allies. Contrary to the wishes of their own peoples and to their former stands, the leaders of some West European countries in fact opposed the Soviet-U.S. accord that was taking shape by starting talking about "the superiority of the Warsaw Pact in conventional arms" and "the danger of removing U.S. missiles from Europe." After all, how much effort and patience were needed in order to solve the problem of "Pershing-1A" with their U.S. nuclear warheads, which official Bonn conceived the idea of preserving on its territory.

Now there is hardly any point in reproaching a series of Western countries for their previous positions. However, for the sake of objectivity, it is necessary nevertheless to compare these positions with the practical actions of the Warsaw Pact countries. Exactly at the time when all the world was talking about the "paralysis of willpower" of a number of West European governments, the GDR And CSSR proposed to the FRG chancellor to start creating a nuclear-free corridor in central Europe. A little later, the Polish leader proposed a new complex initiative for arms reduction and for enhancing trust in central Europe, which is now broadly known as "the Jaruzelski Plan." A whole series of other initiatives from the socialist countries could be mentioned. Proposing them during bilateral negotiations from the UN platform and other international forums, the USSR's allies thereby convincingly demonstrated to their West European neighbors their love of peace, the striving toward arms reduction on a just and constructive basis.

And now, after the Soviet-U.S. agreement is signed, these proposals remain valid. Moreover, they are acquiring a growing significance in light of favorable prospects in the task of reducing strategic offensive weapons by 50%, of eliminating chemical weapons, halting nuclear testing, and reducing armed forces and conventional weapons from the Atlantic to the Urals. As was noted at the meeting in Berlin, the Warsaw Pact countries are full of determination to make their contribution to achievement of these aims in order to banish war from the life of man once and for all.

### Party Research Representatives Meet in Moscow

*LD121007 Moscow TASS in English 2217 GMT 11 Dec 87*

[Text] Moscow December 11 TASS—A conference attended by heads of research establishments of the Communist Party of Argentina, the Bulgarian Communist Party, the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, the Communist Party of Vietnam, the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, the German Communist Party, the Communist Party of Greece, the Yemen Socialist Party, the Colombian Communist Party, the Workers' Party of Korea, the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, the Polish United Workers' Party, the Romanian Communist Party, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the French Communist Party and the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia was held in Moscow today.

The participants exchanged information on the work of the research establishments of fraternal parties in studying problems of social, economic and political development on a national and international scale.

It was noted that the research establishments of communist and workers' parties were developing contacts between themselves with a view to enriching each other's experience, scaling up cooperation and promoting a new political thinking.

The conference examined the interaction between the Great October Socialist Revolution, practical efforts to build socialism and world development. It was emphasized that the renewal of the socialist reality demanded further efforts to study most important aspects of the theory of socialism.

Special attention was devoted to a turning point in the history of international relations—the signing of the Soviet-American Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, to the problem of interrelationship between disarmament and the impact of new political thinking on efforts to resolve global problems facing mankind.

## Gremitskikh News Conference on INF Treaty

*LD092228 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1625 GMT 9 Dec 87*

[Excerpt] Moscow, 9 Dec (TASS)—State and political leaders, world public figures, and ordinary people are expressing with rare unanimity their approval of the historic step—the signing of the treaty on eliminating medium- and shorter-range missiles by the USSR and U.S. leaders. This was emphasized by Yuriy Gremitskikh, deputy head of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Directorate at the opening of a news conference in Moscow today. The meeting with newsmen was dedicated to the scientific conference "Great October and the Present Day" which is now under way in the capital with the participation of representatives of 65 countries.

The signing of the Soviet-U.S. treaty, Gremitskikh stressed, represents a breakthrough toward disarmament and can—given suitable will on the part of both East and West—open up a broad uninterrupted movement toward a world free of wars and violence.

The conclusion of the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles shows clearly, the Foreign Ministry representative stressed, that the most complex issues of the present day can be solved by political means given the firm political will and the readiness to take into account each other's interests. In following this example it is necessary to advance progress toward solving and untangling other topical and acute problems, both in the relations between the two superpowers and in the international relations as a whole.

The treaty signed in Washington marks a serious, earnest improvement of the general international climate, which is necessary for deepening and developing economic relations in the world and, first and foremost, between the socialist countries and the countries of the West, noted Oleg Bogomolov, director of the Economics of the World Socialist System Institute of the USSR Adademy of Sciences. This agreement reinforces trust between the sides and imparts an additional powerful impulse to achieving other accords—not only regarding disarmament, but in the sphere of developing economic links as well.

Naturally, the arms reduction envisaged by the treaty cannot have a very strong impact on the economic situation, whether in the USSR or the United States, academician Bogomolov confirmed. It is merely the first step. Truly major savings in military expenditure will be made with subsequent steps along the road to disarmament, but even that which has already been achieved will serve the economic development of the two countries. Giving up expensive modern arms and directing material values and scientific thought toward civil objectves is important not only for the USSR, but for the United States as well. The arms race has put both countries in an extremely difficult situation. [passage omitted]

## TASS Notes NATO Communique on INF Treaty

*LD112054 Moscow TASS in English 1838 GMT 11 Dec 87*

[Text] Brussels December 11 TASS—U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz spoke here at a NATO council session at a foreign minister level. He informed his colleagues about the results of the talks between the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and U.S. President Ronald Reagan, analyzed the treaty to abolish U.S. and Soviet intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles, which was signed during the talks.

The heads of the foreign policy departments of the NATO member countries issued a communique at the session expressing support for the Soviet-U.S. INF (intermediate-range nuclear forces) Treaty and declaring for its earliest ratification by the U.S. Senate. The NATO ministers hailed the Soviet-U.S. treaty signed by the two countries' leaders in Washington as an important step towards reaching agreements to reduce other types of armaments. The ministers also acknowledged general improvement in East-West relations. At the same time, the final communique sets out NATO's known position on Afghanistan and human rights issues.

Separate agreements between the United States and five West European countries—Britain, West Germany, Italy, Belgium and the Netherlands in which U.S. intermediate-range missiles were deployed or were supposed to be deployed—were signed within the framework of the session. These agreements provide for the termination of all work, the withdrawal of the missiles and implementing procedures for Soviet inspectors to verify compliance with the INF treaty.

The current NATO council session winds up the winter "Atlantic marathon" to include the sessions of the NATO governing military bodies: the Eurogroup, the Military Committee and the Military Planning Committee.

## NATO's Lord Carrington Discusses INF Treaty

*LD131820 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 13 Dec 87*

[Interview with NATO Secretary General Lord Carrington by Television Correspondent Kirpras Mazheyka, at NATO Headquarters in Evere; Mazheyka, Carrington in English with superimposed Russian translation, date not specified—recorded; from the "International Panorama" program presented by IZVESTIYA Political Observer Vitaliy Kobysh]

[Text] [Mazheyka] For the first time within the walls of this department, its boss, NATO Secretary General Lord Carrington, gives an interview for Soviet Television. Mister Secretary General, how do you evaluate the agreement on Euromissiles signed in Washington by Soviet Leader Gorbachev and U.S. President Reagan?

[Carrington] This is what we have been aspiring to for a long time. All the representatives of the 16 NATO countries are very pleased that this has at last happened. We hope that such a comparatively small step—after all, only 3% of all reserves of nuclear weapons that exist in the world are being cut—will lay a good foundation for the future. The two sides wanted to conclude this treaty, which is evidence of an understanding of the problems facing us, each of us. For instance, you are cutting more armaments than the United States; this shows that you accept the principle of asymmetric reduction of armaments under which one side reduces its military potential more than the other. The treaty also shows that the countries of the Warsaw Pact and the North Atlantic bloc are prepared to discuss questions of verification openly and sincerely. I am sure that either of the two parties who signed the treaty could gain the impression that the opposite side is violating it. Thus the question of verification and monitoring [kontrol i proverki] is very essential. It is precisely for this reason that the agreement referred to by you is an important step forward in a process which I hope will continue.

[Mazheyka] Is NATO ready for serious talks with the Warsaw Pact countries on reducing conventional arms in Europe?

[Carrington] You know that the two sides—I mean the Warsaw Pact and NATO—are working very persistently on this problem. At the moment the mandate of the future talks is being discussed in Vienna; the mechanism is being created under which the agreements will be drawn up. A process of drawing up proposals, which we will be able to present after the mandate has been defined, is now underway in our organization. I believe that we in NATO and the Warsaw Pact, just as the peoples of the countries of both alliances, must realize that here we are confronting problems which are more complicated than the question of the reduction of nuclear arms in Europe. When you talk about nuclear missiles you are talking either of missiles or of warheads. In the sphere of conventional arms you talk about geographical aspects, about men, equipment; you talk about the development reached by one side or the other, about the superiority of one side over the other, etc.

Taking into account all these questions, which are not at all simple, and the very complicated subject of the talks, I do not believe that we will achieve success very quickly. But one thing I am sure of is that the Warsaw Pact and NATO must work very persistently on drawing up a treaty. The imbalance in the sphere of conventional arms is precisely what worries us, which first of all influences the state of balance between the two military groupings. This is the decisive factor in determining how far we will proceed at the nuclear arms limitation talks.

[Mazheyka] Thank you very much Mister Secretary General for your interview.

[Kobysh] I wish to draw your attention to the final sentence of Carrington's interview. As you can see, already conditions and reservations are being put forward, and if one speaks bluntly, the process of eliminating nuclear arms is being impeded.

## Pozner on INF Treaty, Emigration, Afghanistan

*LD101351 London BBC Television Network in English 2250 GMT 8 Dec 87*

[From the "Newsnight" program, presented by John Snow in Washington—roundtable discussion chaired by Snow involving former Assistant Defense Secretary Richard Perle, former Secretary of State Edmund Muskie, and Soviet commentator Vladimir Pozner]

[Text] [Snow] Senator Muskie, do you see the bit of irony here in the most conservative American President in recent times sitting down with his Soviet counterpart whom he was referring to...[changes thought] the leader of the country he was referring to only a few years ago as an evil empire?

[Muskie] Well, as I sat there this afternoon watching the signing, that very thought occurred to me. As recently as 3 years ago, and even less, there was no indication that President Reagan was at all interested or at all optimisitc about achieving a result such as we had today. He represented a point of view that I think had been identified in his campaign rhetoric for years. He had been opposed to previously negotiated arms control treaties, and his view of the Soviet empire—you have already described in words that you have recalled. We got the same response from the other side. The Soviet rhetoric was fully as high. Yet here, as I sat there, and I was in the room, there was a feeling of relaxation, cordiality, and even friendship. What brought it about? I am convinced the underlying reality of the national security interests of both countries brought it about. I think that basically controls the policies of countries today: their national security interests.

[Snow] Now Richard Perle, you were a member of this administration, if I may say so, in the time when it was rather more hawklike than it is now. Now, do you welcome this new momentum, the new thrust of Mr Reagan's policy of accomodation with the Soviet Union? Do you welcome this treaty, and would you welcome a further START treaty beyond it?

[Perle] It would depend of course on the terms of that treaty, just as the outcome of this treaty depends on the terms, which are precisely those that Ronald Reagan proposed in 1981. I think much of what has been interpreted to be a shift in the President's underlying policy in fact represents the necessary tactics of long negotiation. In order to achieve this success, we had to stay very steady and very firm in the face of repeated Soviet rejection of this proposal. The President believed

that if we stood steady and firm, if our European allies carried out the deployment, then we could achieve this result. I think he has been proven right.

[Snow] You do not agree with General Rogers that this is a bad treaty?

[Perle] No, I disagree with the general about this.

[Snow] Mr Pozner, if the Senate now throws this treaty out, you say, as you told us yesterday, that would be a disaster. But supposing the Americans came back and said we want to renogotiate this treaty. How about that?

[Pozner] I do not think they would, frankly. How do you renegotiate it after you have been doing it for 7 years? I came across a very interesting article today in THE WASHINGTON POST reviewing the treaty's history. It was very openly stated that from the outset, the American side really did not think they would succeed. It was almost seen as a political exercise. The real interest was not negotiating but getting the missiles deployed. The hint was almost, it was not said that way, but the hint was that the proposal was made with a view that the Russians would reject it. What I think is happening, what is ironic—I would agree with you, it is interesting that it happened with Ronald Reagan, just as it was interesting many years ago when it happened with Richard Nixon to a point—but since the idea was that the Russians would not accept it anyway, that was fine. Now when the Russians went more than halfway, in fact, made all the concessions, and said yes, and in fact wanted even more stringent verification....

[Snow, interrupting] Mr Perle, have they made all the concessions?

[Perle] [words indistinct] There have been concessions on both sides, but clearly the Soviet side began by rejecting this proposal. They are now prepared to accept it. They have made concessions. But I would not make too much of THE WASHINGTON POST's interpretation of this.

[Pozner] Well, I would just like to finish my thought, if I may. When agreement was reached, then the people who have been very, very vocally supporting President Reagan are now attacking him, his own conservative team, as it were. But the most incredible kinds of statements blaming his wife, his age, he is no longer the man he was— I think that is a very interesting development.

[Snow] All right, now, Mr Perle. Did you think Mr Reagan should now make it a condition of further arms control progress that the Russians give him the answers he needs on Afghanistan and human rights?

[Perle] As a practical matter, we are not going to be able to get very far [5-second break in transmission] Like Afghanistan and because of the nature of this country, a country of immigrants and the deep feelings of the American people, this was evidence as the summit opened that a quarter of a million people who had made their way to Washington to demonstrate in support of human rights and, in particular, in support of free emigration from the Soviet Union, you can only go so far without a change on these fundamental issues of the use of Soviet power in Afghanistan and human rights.

[Snow] What is your demand on human rights? What is the answer you want from Mr Gorbachev?

[Perle] For a start, we would like to see, most of the world would like to see, those individuals who wish to leave the Soviet Union permitted to do so.

[Snow] Mr Pozner.

[Pozner] You know, my view has been that— I have said many times, I have said it at home, I have said it here, that I believe our policy should be whoever wants to go, go. That is my personal view. If you want to come back, incidentally, you should also have that right.

[Snow] But that is not the reality, is it? There are thousands of Jews who want to leave now.

[Pozner] It is my viewpoint. You are asking me what I think. I am telling you what I think. Now, on the other hand, when I hear that 400,000 Jews wish to leave the country, I laugh at that. I happen to have a very close friend who is Jewish and has received four official invitations from Israel to go visit relatives he has never had, and he has never asked to go. That is four people in the count, because that is the way they are counting. So when you say 400,000, I am saying, come on, give me a break. But my view is, whoever wants to go should be able to go. I think we are moving in that direction. Notwithstanding all the...

[Snow, interrupting] Fair enough. Mr Muskie?

[Muskie] Well, as one looks at the curve, I think that it was at a low point in 1970. Then it climbed for 2 or 3 years, about the time that I think the Jackson-Vanik Amendment was adopted. It climbed, then it dropped with the next chill in our general relations, and then it climbed again. I think there were two peaks and two valleys during that period, which suggests to me that if we are truly to make progress in all areas of concern to both sides, those movements have got to go forward together. I do not know what the ultimate possibilities are in the Soviet system of the right and the freedom to travel. Whether or not it will ever match ours, I doubt, but I think Americans would expect that Russians should move in that direction.

[Snow] All right. Mr Perle, let us move on to Afghanistan. What is your minimum demand of the Soviets at this summit on Afghanistan?

[Perle] Well, it is not very complicated. They arrived in a matter of days on Christmas Eve in 1979. They could be home by Christmas Eve if they decided to leave Afghanistan and let the Afghans decide their own future.

[Snow] Would you, in return for that, be prepared to lift American support for the rebels, the freedom fighters as you call them, in Afghanistan?

[Perle] Well, I do not think you would have a rebellion. I think you would have a new government in Afghanistan if the Soviet troops were to leave. That is clearly why they remain. They know that. They know that this government would not last 24 hours without military support from Soviet troops.

[Pozner] I do not buy that. I do not buy it at all. The policy decision to pull out of Afghanistan has been made. It has been officially stated. I think that there are forces in this country delighted that the Soviet Union is bogged down in Afghanistan. It is being used for a political purpose. I think basically we have asked the United States to help us get out, if you are really interested in stopping the bloodshed.

[Snow] But can you get out and leave a government in Afghanistan that supports, that is a friend of the Soviet Union?

[Pozner] I believe we can get out, provided that indeed no more aid is given to what people here call freedom fighters and that we call counterrevolutionaries. There can be a coalition government in Afghanistan, and it can be a neutral country neither pro-Soviet nor pro-American, instead of being an enemy on our borders. I believe it is possible, provided that the United States is also interested in the same. I do not think it is.

[Muskie] I have this question to put to Vladimir: Will the Soviet Union pull out before the Soviet Union has had a maximum influence on the shape of the government to be left behind?

[Pozner] I believe that, as stated by Mr Gorbachev, the political will to pull out is right there. If there were the same kind of approach, if I may use that term, toward the Afghan problem as there was toward the INF problem, I think yes. It is not a question of shaping the government. I do not believe you can shape the government, pull out, and hope it is going to stay that way anyway.

[Snow] But supposing when you pull out, the Afghan freedom fighters take over the Government of Afghanistan, have you then completely lost?

[Pozner] Armed to the teeth with the tanks and the whatnot of the United States. That is exactly what you said.

[Snow] Okay, but haven't you then lost the war, and can you afford that political disaster?

[Pozner] I say we should not have a bloodbath in that country one way or the other. I think we should all work for that, if we care about the people and not about the politics.

[Perle] Let us be clear about what is going on in Afghanistan, Vladimir. The only tanks in Afghanistan are Russian tanks. There are no American tanks in Afghanistan, and there are no American planes in Afghanistan.

[Pozner, interrupting] There are American missiles.

[Perle] There are American antiaircraft weapons, but those would be useless and ineffective if there were no Soviet aircraft to shoot down. If you leave, the problem of support to the mujahidin solves itself.

[Pozner] I do not think it does if they are not supported. If they are not supported by the United States, if they no longer get the military hardware, then I would tend to agree.

[Snow] Final question. Richard Perle, today the INF Treaty was signed. Do you trust the Russians not to cheat?

[Perle] No, I do not. On the other hand, the potential advantages of cheating are so minimal that I think the Soviets would be foolish, indeed, to cheat, and so I doubt...

[Snow, interrupting] Do you trust the Americans, Mr Pozner?

[Pozner] Totally mutual situation. They do not trust us, nor should they. We do not trust them, nor should we. The whole point is to get the kind of verification that makes cheating almost impossible. That is what verification is all about. We have not reached the point where we can trust each other.

[Snow] Thank you Mr Pozner, thank you Senator Muskie, and thank you Richard Perle.

## 'Top Priority' Program on Summit Meeting

*LD122026 Moscow World Service in English 1610 GMT 12 Dec 87*

["Top Priority" program, presented by Pavel Kuznetsov, with professors Radomir Bogdanov and Sergey Plekhanov; not further identified]

[Text] [Kuznetsov] Hello everybody. Welcome to "Top Priority". I'm Pavel Kuznetsov, your host. Together with me are professors Radomir Bogdanov and Sergey Plekahanov. It's been a long time since I last saw you gentlemen. Yeah, I don't mind seeing you every day as long as we do some business, and today...

[Unidentified voice] [Words indistinct].

[Kuznetsov] Yeah, you do some business, OK, and today it is naturally the outcome of the Washington summit between Mikhail Gorbachev and President Reagan. In my view what makes this summit very different from the previous ones held in the United States by former Soviet leaders is that this time it was all work and no play. Mikhail Gorbachev, aside from very frank and business-like, and at times very tough sessions with President Reagan, has met with leading personalities from the business, scientific, cultural, intellectual communities.

[Unidentified voice] and the mass media.

[Kuznetsov] Mass media, right, with U.S. publishers.

[Unidentified voice] (?That's) very important by the way.

[Kuznetsov] Right, since we are representing...

[Bogdanov interrupts] Yeah, we are representing the [pauses] the same crowd.

[Kuznetsov] Yes. Mikhail Gorbachev has done a lot of talking and listening. He has explained the intricacies of the Soviet domestic policy known everywhere in the world as glasnost and perestroyka. Shortly before leaving Washington D.C. he held a press conference, and President Reagan has had an interview summing up his impressions of the summit. Now, my question to you: What are the major results of this event? Professor Bogdanov.

[Bogdanov] Pavel, this is very difficult question indeed.

[Kuznetsov] Why?

[Bogdanov] You know why; it sounds, it sounds like a very, very ordinary question because I believe that this question has been asked everywhere now, and I'm afraid that people are getting the same standard answer: The results are great, or the results are not so great, or something like that. Number one is obvious of course the signing of the treaty, the INF Treaty. And number two result to my mind is that the President and the secretary general had the unique opportunity to look at each other's eyes and to talk to each other frankly.

[Kuznetsov interrupts] It was their third opportunity in less than 3 years.

[Bogdanov continues] That was the third, third opportunity, but each opportunity was accompanied by some progress in the Soviet-American relations, and I believe that this time when they looked at each other's eyes and they talked, sometimes very tough manner, (?some) always honestly, that will also improve, further improve the Soviet-American relations.

[Kuznetsov] Professor Bogdanov.

[Bogdanov] They may not, Pavel, I'm sorry, they may not agree on all points, and I would be really amazed if somebody tells me that they have agreed on all points, I would not believe that.

[Kuznetsov] Well, I agree with you 100% that the signing of the INF Treaty was an example of progress.

[Plekhanov] That's true, very true.

[Kuznetsov] But at the same time, at the end of the summit the two sides failed to announce that they reached agreement on 50% cuts in strategic offensive arms, although respective teams of experts in Geneva were given instructions to narrow differences on this subject to enable the USSR and the United States to sign this treaty when President Reagan comes to this country next year.

[Bogdanov] Let me defend a little bit, American President, if I may, and let me put a question to you Sergey, who is an expert on America, and to you Pavel, who is also an expert on America. Do you expect the American President, when he is under such a heavy attack from his political base that he's selling out, that when put all, all kind of names on him, do you expect him that he will dare to move in such a way in that (?view) that he will be further attacked and maybe politically destroyed? [sentence as heard] That's my question, professional question.

[Kuznetsov] OK, Professor Plekhanov, you've been silent for some time, and here's question to you. While meeting with representatives of the American mass media with U.S. publishers, Mikhail Gorbachev was asked about whether the INF Treaty was not after all a product of domestic weakensses and problems that both leaders are faced with, and that these problems have actually pushed them into signing this treaty?

[Plekhanov] I didn't hear that question (?so) [words indistinct] I don't know what he answered to that, but...

[Kuznetsov] No, this is my question to you. I heard that question...

[Plekhanov] You heard the question, but you didn't hear the answer.

[Kuznetsov] You know I did hear the answer, I'd like to have it from you.

[Bogdanov] It's provocate...

[Plekhanov] That's provocative, I didn't, I didn't see...

[Kuznetsov] We're not at the summit, we're in, at Radio Moscow studios.

[Plekhanov] We are much below the summit.

[Kuznetsov] Much below the summit, OK. If your were asked this question?

[Plekhanov] Well, I would say that domestic concerns are of course important. We would like to spend much less on armaments, and the United States with the huge budget deficit that they have and other problems with the over-militarization of the economy would also, [pauses] would also know where to spend the money and resources which would be freed as a result of cutbacks in nuclear armaments. But this is only part of the story. The other part of the story is that it's about time that we put an end to the arms race and began rolling back this process of accumulating armaments. Otherwise, you know, we may very soon come to a very sorry end. So, in that respect I think that the publishers, by raising the problem of domestic constraints or domestic concerns were partly right, but I would not overemphasize that.

[Kuznetsov] I disagree with the logic of this question because whenever we embark on disarmament or arms reductions this is supposed to be a sign of weakness, not of strength [words indistinct].

[Plekhanov] That's right, in fact. In fact if you feel secure while you reduce your armaments it doesn't show that you're weak, it shows that you're self-confident enough that you can do without excessive armaments, so in that sense it's not a sign of weakness but a sign of strength.

[Bogdanov] Pavel, I'm but, I'm afraid that you didn't like my question because you, you are not behaving in a democratic way [words indistinct]. I put this question to Sergey and to you.

[Kuznetsov] I didn't know you were an announcer.

[Bogdanov] Oh yes, of course I would like you to answer my question because I have my opinion on that and I would like to hear yours.

[Kuznetsov] Ok, go ahead.

[Plekhanov] Yeah, I myself would have liked to see greater movement on the strategic offensive armaments, and while trying to analyze what has happened and what were the breaks on the American side, because I'm (?not), I'm, I'm quite sure that there were no breaks on the Soviet side. Gorbachev went to Washington having full support, full backing of the Soviet leadership and of the Soviet people, and with a determination to go very far toward a compromise, and apparently the American side chose not to go as far as we expected that it would, and one reason, and perhaps the main reason, is that the very harsh criticism from the right wing of the Republican Party and some figures in the establishment [words indistinct] yeah, bipartisan estalishment...

[Bogdanov interrupts] Yes, and in the, the administration.

[Plekhanov]...and in the administration.

[Bogdanov]...And in the administration itself, so what I expect Pavel, let me finish with that, what (?that) I expect, that I expect a growing resistance from the ultraconservatives to the presidential policy now...

[Kuznetsov interrupts]...and that President Reagan's failure to announce that he is ready to accept 50% cuts was sort of a tactical move not to antagonize the...

[Bogdanov interrupts] That is my opinion. That's my opinion.

[Kuznetsov] Alright. In his interview on Thursday, President Reagan said a number of very encouraging things concerning the state of U.S.-Soviet relations. For example, he called the summit a clear success, that it was a critical step toward building a more durable peace, and that it had put Soviet-American relations on a far more candid and a far more realistic footing. Judging by that interview Ronald Reagan has finally discovered that Moscow is no longer pursuing world domination, although he said I'm not going to drop my guard. I think this is a great achievement by itself since this ostensible world domination by the Soviets has been one of his favorite themes for such a long time.

[Plekhanov] Yes, I think that the President is clearly modifying his views of international politics and his views of the Soviet Union. You see, Ronald Reagan is one of the most ideological presidents in the United States, perhaps the most ideological President of the United States.

[Kuznetsov] Even more so than President Nixon?

[Plekhanov] Oh, absolutely [words indistinct] Nixon was not [words indistinct]. Nixon was a very pragmatic President. Ronald Reagan has spent most of his political life as an idealogue, as a leader of a very ideological movement, political movement, in the United States. He spent less time wheeling and dealing in Washington. So for him the 7 years that he has spent in the White House has been an encounter with reality, a kind of an encounter with a big university, and he has learned some lessons I believe, despite his age, and we should underestimate...

[Bogdanov interrupts] By the way, it goes to his credit, Sergey. Absolutely, it's all to his credit. He's flexible, he's flexible.

[Kuznetsov] Gentlemen, we've been talking about the American leader for quite some time already. Let's turn around and look at our leader. The extensive coverage of the summit here, in the United States and in many other countries, has enabled Mikhail Gorbachev to engage in a good deal of propaganda work as he himself put it on a

number of occasions, jokingly. But jokes aside, Americans had a unique chance to see more of our leader and to hear him out on very very acute and sticky issues, and I think that his personality was a big factor behind the summit being a success.

[Bogdanov] My point is that American listeners should understand one thing, that what they saw in Gorbachev, it's very deeply reflecting the changes in the Soviet Union. He's, he's brought to America, he's shown, he's demonstrated to America how we are changing, and I believe that's the most important part of that story whatever you call it, propaganda or public relations, or public diplomacy. If you look at the route you will see the changes in the Soviet Union. That America has to deal and has to live with a new Soviet society. That is being reflected, demonstrated by the new Soviet leader.

[Kuznetsov] In other words, what you are suggesting is that he's not only an example of a new crop, a new generation of Soviet leaders, but part of the changing Soviet society.

[Bogdanov] Oh yes, oh yes, I would insist on that.

[Plekhanov] And there is one more thing which our listeners should have in mind. The Gorbachev that they saw on their television screen is the very Gorbachev that we are accustomed to seeing on our television screen, and he was absolutely natural, the things, the philosophy that he was discussing with Americans are absolutely the same views that he's been sharing with us and discussing with us, domestically. So it's part and parcel of his personality and of the policies which our leadership has been pursuing.

[Bogdanov] You mean to say that there is one Gorbachev, there is no dual Gorbachev, there is one for America, one for the Soviet Union...

[Kuznetsov interrupts] And for the rest of the world.

[Bogdanov continues]...and for the rest of the world.

[Kuznetsov] Ok, one of the major American newspapers said on Friday that most obviously Moscow would like to play up the outcome of the summit, while in Washington some people would try to do the opposite, play it down.

[Bogdanov] It signifies one thing. If you look at that, what happened in Washington, from the point of view of the dirty politics [pauses] dirty politics, of course you may say this and that, but there is another approach. If you lay all that on the table and you invite people to see what is on the table, and you have a number of things on the table. [sentence as heard] You have number one, a treaty eliminating nuclear missiles, intermediate...

[Unidentified voice interrupts] Intermediate and shorter range...

[Bogdanov continues] ...then you have another agreement which is to my mind very important, one about resuming Aeroflot and Pan Am flights between the two countries, you have a renewal of Soviet-American agreement on (?ocean) problems and you have some other...

[Kuznetsov] Planetary research...

[Bogdanov] ...planetary research...

[Plekhanov] The test ban treaty [words indistinct]

[Bogdanov] ...the test ban treaty, '76. When you have all that on the table and judge by yourself, what is it, It is a success or it is a failure.

[Kuznetsov] Yes, there was less headway at the summit on regional issues and human rights. It looks like the White House is not completely satisfied with our decision to pull out from Afghanistan within 12 months, and the most acute arguments occured when these issues were discussed. Are we not going to bridge them or somehow narrow them in the near future? What is your point of view?

[Plekhanov] Well, I wouldn't put it in the sense that the White House is not satisfied with our decisions. We have more than enough reason to be dissatisfied with the posture of the Reagan administration. The key question is, as Comrade Gorbachev put it, you know we are not trying to turn Afghanistan into a pro-Soviet Country. But the United States should stop trying to turn it into a pro-American country. Afghanistan should be neutral...

[Kuznetsov] Nonaligned...

[Plekhanov] Nonaligned, neutral, independent, and we're prepared to assist in the political settlement, take part in the political settlement which will make Afghanistan such a country. We are prepared to withdraw our troops within 12 months; the political decision to that effect has been taken. A question of date, or even a shorter time, the question of the date, of the start of the withdrawal should be the same, should be decided together with the Americans because that should also be the date they stop funding and arming the antigovernment forces in Afghanistan.

[Kuznetsov] And the same applies, seen to apply to human rights because we are, to put it mildly dissatisfied with a lot of things in the area of human rights in the United States.

[Plekhanov] You see, I think, I think that these two areas, regional issues and Afghanistan, have become [words indistinct], and human rights, have become an area, have become a way for the Reagan administration to kind of compensate the far right in the United States for the agreement on nuclear missiles, because you know the agreement, the nuclear agreement is seen as, as a

great concession to the Russians because [words indistinct] a (?betrayal) of the hard line, and so on and so forth. And since those people on the right are shouting so loudly the administration is forced I think by political calculation to toughen its stand on regional issues and human rights.

[Kuznetsov] The summits in Geneva and Reykjavik have given a big push to bilateral programs projects, all sorts of exchanges. We've touched on that already. Mikhail Gorbachev, while in Washington D.C., kept stressing the need for breaking down all those stereotypes that stand in the way of better relations not only in fact between the Soviet Union and the United States, but between the Soviet Union and other countries of the world, especially the Western world. Will there be a thaw in this humanitarian field? What are your predictions?

[Bogdanov] Yes, I believe that we'll be making major changes in our, break in our, stereotypes. The fact itself that the Soviet audience saw the American President every day for several hours per day, it's a major breakthrough. Pavel could you believe that a year, or 2 years ago..?

[Kuznetsov] Yes, one of the, one Soviet family in Moscow, did you read this report in one of Moscow's newspapers, had twins [words indistinct] that were called Misha and Ronald [words indistinct].

[Bogdanov] That's a very vivid example of breaking the stereotype. Misha and Ronald in Moscow.

[Kuznetsov] Let's hope that we'll have Ronald Reagan in Moscow, and in this respect, your final observations, your final comments.

[Bogdanov] I'm optimistic. I'm more optimistic about the...

[Kuznetsov interrupts]..The prospects of Soviet-American relations...

[Bogdanov interrupts]...of improvement in the Soviet-American relations than before.

[Kuznetsvo] You, Sergey.

[Plekhanov] In Geneva there was a psychological breakthrough. In Reykjavik there was a conceptual breakthrough. In Washington we have had a political breakthrough. We now have a treaty. I think that's a good movement and I hope that it will continue.

[Kuznetsov] Thank you gentlemen for coming to the studio and sharing your views on the summit on "Top Priority". I'm Pavel Kuznetsov signing off till next week on the same wavelength and at the same time. Goodbye.

**Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable'**
*LD132120 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 13 Dec 87*

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Igor Pavlovich Charikov, All-Union radio foreign affairs political commentator; Volf Nikolayevich Sedykh, NOVOSTI political observer; Viktor Aleksandrovich Tsoppi, MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI observer]

[Text] [Charikov] And so, yet another important step has been made in the history of Soviet-U.S. relations toward their normalization. This step has been made in a sphere presenting the greatest complexity, I would say, an increasing complexity. This is the field of arms control and disarmament. The quantity of arms that both states have and their huge joint destructive force—which is difficult for the human mind to imagine—are such that the issue, or to be precise, the problem, of disarmament has acquired an international nature. There was a time when both states had intercontinental nuclear arms at their disposal. That was one qualitative situation. Then the frontier of nuclear missile confrontation shifted, as it were, to Western Europe and a new class of arms appeared called medium- and shorter-range missiles, as well as battlefield missiles. But of course the point is not in the naming of the classes. After all, the division of nuclear missile systems according to their range appeared, or was introduced, exclusively for the convenience of conducting negotiations. The point is that U.S. missiles appeared in Europe, and the situation acquired a new quality.

[Tsoppi] Because their missiles were aimed first and foremost at the Soviet Union.

[Charikov] Well, of course, and at our allies. Thus, when for the first time a meeting took place between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and the President of the United States, Ronald Reagan, in Geneva, the situation was really not a simple one. At the time a certain success was achieved in Geneva, an even greater success was achieved in Reykjavik, and right now we can establish that the third meeting between the leaders of the two powers that has just ended in Washington, has brought, I would say, an immeasurable success in the whole history, perhaps, of Soviet-U.S. relations. The subject matter was not reduction or limitation of some class of arms, but the elimination of a whole class of missiles, the elimination, that is, their destruction.

Here I would like to refer to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's address to the press conference in Washington, where he summed up in great depth all that was done in these few days of talks in the United States of America. This, the third meeting to have taken place in 2 and 1/2 years, speaks of the fact that the Soviet-U.S. political dialogue has acquired a certain dynamism. Our relations, as Mikhail Sergeyevich said, have reached a new and very important stage when military problems are

being solved in linkage with political ones. It was established that progress had been reached. This progress is based on those accords reached in Geneva and in Reykjavik. Moreover, at their meeting in Washington both leaders confirmed that nuclear war must not be unleashed, that there can be no victors in it, and that both leaders of the two powers are imbued with the resolve to prevent any war between our countries, either a nuclear or a conventional one. This pledge is viewed as being open-ended, and there was emphasis of the particular responsibility that lies on the Soviet Union and the United States of America for seeking realistic ways for preventing military confrontation. Naturally, here we are not belittling the role of the Western European countries, the allies of the United States, and our allies in the Warsaw Pact organization, but nevertheless, let us really face up to the truth: A special responsibility lies on the leaders of our two countries, for our powers have at their disposal greater arsenals of nuclear arms than other countries.

[Tsoppi] Yes, I think that both leaders, both Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and President Reagan measured up to this responsibility.

A really qualitatively new shift has taken place in international relations. I view it indeed as such. You know, historical analogies are generally perfidious; they are not always appropriate, not always convincing, and can mislead if they are resorted to irresponsibly, if a given old precedent is projected onto the presentday situation. But, you know, throughout all these days, when we have been staring at televisions screens with such taunt attention, and listening not just to every word by the participants in the Washington summit conversation, but also to the intonation with which these words were pronounced, then rereading all the speeches by Mikhail Sergeyevich and Ronald Reagan in the newspapers, emphasizing what was the most interesting, new and significant—and there really was a lot of that—and peering at their faces, well, I personally have been beset by the thought—maybe it may appear to be fairly illogical—I have been beset by the thought that it is a sort of opening up of a second front, which we have awaited for so long. You remember how, during World War II, we were trying to guess all the time when they day would come when our allies in the anti-Hitler coalition would finally embark on the decisive battle with the common enemy in the West of Europe, how we were pained that they were tarrying, and how we were glad when in 1944, the Americans and the British finally landed on the shore of Normandy in France. They were, of course, very late. The crash of fascism had already been secured on the Eastern front by our Army, but nevertheless, nevertheless, we won together, which the participants in the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting have now recalled very appositely. Well, you may ask what the connection is? In my view, the connection is a direct one. At that time we were allies because we had a common enemy: Nazi Germany. Today we have a common enemy as well, we have had it for a long time already: It is nuclear weapons.

[Charikov] Since 1945.

[Tsoppi] It encroaches upon our life, upon our future. Or rather no, it is more terrible, if only because this enemy has entrenched itself deeply both in our country and in the United States, and on the soil of other peoples, Europe in the first instance, and neither we, nor the Americans or the Europeans can survive if we allow this common super-foe to act. That is why, by dint of fate and by dint of history we have once again become allies. We must be, we are obliged to be allies, and that is why the conclusion of the first treaty in history on the elimination of the first part—be it still a small one—of the nuclear arsenal is a great start. Our country has been striving for it for such a long time, and for many years it has waged war against the very possibility of nuclear conflict. In general it has waged it alone, well, of course, with the support of our allies, but world socialism has been waging it alone, understanding that it is a war for peace and the survival of mankind, and that means for a just cause. Now, when we and the United States have jointly, and in pace with each other, made a carefully thought-out, calculated and synchronized step in a frontal offensive against this common sworn enemy, we have made the first step that must be followed by a second one, a third one and all the subsequent ones.

Today we can already say that the second front has been opened up, that the first victory has been scored. Whose victory? Ours, the Americans'? I wouldn't start putting the question that way. I think that it is our common victory as well as that of all mankind. The victory of common sense, which, as we reckon, is fated to rule the further course of historical development. What is the most important thing in this meeting, in my view, in this bold breach through the palisade of prejudices, mistrust, enmity, through the nuclear curtain that divides us? The fact that finally the day has dawned when we can be proud that we live in the world, that we are all people, as the president of one of the major U.S. Television companies, said. Or—here I'm already quoting President Reagan—the time has come to live. Yes, the time has come to live as people, to live together with an opposite system. We are two inseparable and connected parts of one civilization. There is nowhere for us to get away from each other. We have lived a long time in enmity. It is already time for us today to live really as people.

[Charikov] Viktor Aleksandrovich, you know, it seems to me that this phrase uttered by Reagan...

[Tsoppi, interrupting] The time has come to live.

[Charikov] ...that the time has come to live is a sort of acknowledgement of the new political thinking.

[Tsoppi] Undoubtedly.

[Charikov] Because all his utterances up until recently, let's be frank, in general were of an opposed nature, and this is a gratifying occurrence, that the President of the

United States, one of the most conservative people in the United States, acknowledges the necessity of manifesting a new approach, an absolutely new approach, to a new, a qualitatively new situation. That is, there is a noticeable shift in progress, I would say, toward an understanding of the danger contained within these missiles, warheads and so on which are difficult for the human mind to imagine. The average American man, the average man in the good sense of the word, the man in the street, as they say...

[Tsoppi interrupting] Is awakening to common ssnse.

[Charikov] Absolutely right. The greatest credit for this, the greatest credit goes to the persistent efforts being made personally by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in calling equally on the U.S. leadership and on the leading political figures of that country to enter the road of new political thinking. Regretfully, of course, there still remain many opponents of this new thinking, they are adherents of the previous course, the course of confrontation, but I think that, all in all, common sense is gradually going to prevail.

[Tsoppi] I think that this awakening concerns not just the United States.

[Charikov] Of course.

[Tsoppi] Not just the United States. It concerns and very much affects, I'd say, the United States' allies in Europe.

[Sedykh] Yes, that is true. We have now been speaking more of Soviet-U.S. relations, because this historic process, the signing of the treaty, took place in Washington and, naturally, formally it is a Soviet-U.S. agreement. However, it should be emphasized that at the same time the treaty is also of an international nature. Although it was in the United States that the crucial, indeed historic negotiations have now been taking place, they affected not just the United States and the Soviet Union; they affected, perhaps even first and foremost, the fate of Europe—our old world. The interesting thing is that the evolution of which you spoke, the evolution toward understanding, toward new thinking, which is gradually affecting the various circles of Americans, the very same evolution is taking place also in Western Europe. Well, we could say that it gripped a long time ago the popular masses and the leadership circles of the socialist countries, our allies, who are at one with us on the necessity for new approaches to the solution of the most complex international issues, but it should also be noted that the other part of Europe, Western Europe, is also gradually beginning to awaken, to turn toward this new thinking. Prior to starting this discussion we looked yet again through all the news reports from Europe...

[Charikov, interrupting] And weren't there a lot of them.

[Sedykh] There was a huge amount, a huge file, and they keep on coming in with no end in sight.

[Charikov] News reports and also articles from periodicals, magazines...

[Tsoppi, interrupting] Statements by statesmen.

[Charikov] That's right.

[Sedykh] We tried to sort them out into files—positive comments and negative comments—and I can tell you that the first file, with positive comments, is significantly greater than the second. That is why I would like, considering what we [illegible], well, to cite several characteristic pronouncements.

Well, as far as the soci[illegible]ncerned, here indeed we have una[illegible]ent of an historic turn toward r[illegible]l the solution of the most comp[illegible]n place in Washington.

[Tsoppi] And toward new actions.

[Sedykh] New actions. A new stage, let's say the minimum stage along the greatly complicated road to nuclear disarmament. Here is, for example, what Comrade Honecker, the GDR leader, emphasizes: The impact of this treaty will be felt especially in Europe. We never concealed that the deployment of additional nuclear weapons in the West and in the East did not cause us joy.

You see, he speaks completely frankly and you can understand, you can understand the feelings of the population of the GDR, in particular, where missiles were deployed.

[Charikov] In Czechoslovakia, incidentally, it was the same.

[Sedykh] And the same thing in Czechoslovakia, analogically, that's right. Comrade Honecker goes on: Thus we are all the more grateful and thankful to all those who, with a sense of reality and readiness to compromise—and I stress compromise—worked out this treaty in the course of long and complex but ultimately successful negotiations. The efforts of the Soviet Union, which have been implemented in a constructive direction from Geneva through Reykjavik and up to the present conclusion of the treaty in Washington, have invariably had our full support and we ourselves have been making an active contribution.

Here I would like to emphasize that it is the Soviet Union which has now been taking part in the negotiations and in the signing of the treaty in Washington, but we invariably felt the full support of our allies.

[Charikov] Which, incidentally, was discussed at the conference, the meeting in Berlin which took place on Friday.

[Sedykh] Absolutely. And here is an interesting thing. That was the opinion of the leader of the GDR. Let's take a look at the opinion of the leader of the FRG.

[Tsoppi] The other German state.

[Sedykh] The other German state. Mr Kohl, the chancellor of the FRG, called the signing of the treaty an historic event. This great success in the cause of disarmament became possible thanks to the constructive activity of the leaders of both great powers in the field of foreign policy and security policy, said Mr Kohl. He also noted, in a sense, the procedure for eliminating nuclear missiles. The procedure, according to Kohl, in the FRG, say, will be as follows: That in 2 years' time, in 1989, the first medium- and shorter-range missiles will be withdrawn from FRG territory; while in 1991 they will all be eliminated. That is something one can only be happy about. Well, frankly, one would wish these missiles to be eliminated as early as today or tomorrow.

[Charikov] But it's not that simple.

[Sedykh] That's right. But that's the planned schedule. Let us hope that perhaps it can be shortened somehow and at the very least not extended ad infinitum.

I would like to emphasize the following idea. Here we have the leaders of the two German states—capitalist and socialist—apparently similarly approving this historic fact of the signing of the treaty. But I would like to go on to say that, all in all, further on there also follow serious differences in the assessment of the consequences of that treaty equally between Kohl and Honecker and, to put it bluntly, between us and our Western partners.

[Tsoppi] Volf Nikolayevich, for several years you have worked as a PRAVDA correspondent in Paris. Presumably after leaving there you have not forgotten France, and even now you are following its politics and things which take place there. How do the French, who are not members of the NATO military organization, who have no U.S. medium- and shorter-range missiles on their territory...

[Charikov, interrupting] Instead they have their own.

[Tsoppi] That's right, instead they have their own weapons, but how are they reacting?

[Sedykh] That's an extremely interesting question and, let's be frank, a very complicated one. That is, if we look at the whole spectrum of opinions now in the Western European countries in this case, there are completely different nuances there. Let us begin with the fact that the group of European, West European countries where at present the missiles that we have mentioned are, all in all, they will probably be glad to be rid of these missiles. Well, indeed, imagine who would not be glad that finally we can defuse the powder—or rather nuclear—keg atop which all of us Europeans live? If you think about it, everyone, including us, are permanently living on top of a nuclear keg. Finally, it can be defused and that already is a great chance for peace. To put it briefly, in Holland or in Belgium, in the FRG, where these nuclear missiles are, the population, and I am speaking about the population above all—the ordinary people or the man in the street, as we say—are in the main very glad of this circumstances. Here there are interesting reports which say that on the say of the places where these U.S. nuclear missiles are sited. For example, Western agencies and U.S. agencies were reporting that in many cities and population centers in Western Europe people were impatiently waiting for news from Washington about the signing of the treaty. When the news finally arrived festive—and they literally say festive—processions passed through the streets of Comiso, in Italy, Greenham Common and London, in Britain, and near the U.S. bases in the FRG, where the medium-range missiles are now sited.

[Charikov, interrupting] And in Belgium, in Florennes, there too [words indistinct].

[Sedykh] That's right, that's right. We could cite a great many such examples. That was the reaction of the ordinary people, ordinary people. How did the leadership cricles in those countries receive it? Again in a variety of ways, again in a variety of ways. Well, from this group of Western European countries we could single out France and Britain, which, as you correctly pointed out, have their own nuclear weapons. And they, France, let's say, has a well known difference in position with the FRG, which has no nuclear weapons.

[Tsoppi interrupting] But as far as I know...

[Sedykh continuing]...or of Italy.

[Tsoppi] But as far as I know, the president of France has positively...

[Sedykh interrupting] Yes, yes.

[Tsoppi continuing]...received the treaty.

[Sedykh] That's very interesting. Mitterrand, the French president, Francois Mitterrand, said roughly this—and repeated it several times—I do not understand what depravity of thought one must have not to be delighted at the scrapping of nuclear missiles capable of reaching France. That is what the French president said: depravity of thought. Sadly such people are not so hard to come by in Western Europe.

[Tsoppi] I'd like to tell you...

[Sedykh interrupting] Yes.

[Tsoppi continuing]...that even in France there is for example a minister, Minister of Culture Francois Leotard, who to my mind simply revealed a fairly low level of political culture when he said that the treaty signed in Washington was useless and dangerous.

[Sedkh] The statements of the Socialists are interesting, in particular of Jospin, the first secretary of the Socialist Party, who also supports the signing of the treaty, but he already has further reservations. He is already talking of the fact that it is necessary to look for possibilites of strengthening the future security of France, etc. There, quite briefly, is what the reaction is in France to this historic event.

[Tsoppi] I think we should come back to the treaty again and think about what awaits it—what road it will have to cover in order...

[Charikov interrupting] Excactly, its future destiny is not without interest for us either.

[Tsoppi continuing]...to actually become law for the Soviet Union and the United States.

[Charikov] Coming back to the talks, I'd like to stress that the signing of a treaty to scrap medium- and shorter-range missiles, while it was its most important material achievement, was far from being the only one. As Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said at the press conference, the meetings and talks held in the U.S. capital centered attention on the problem of a real and radical cut in strategic offensive weapons. This is regarded as the central issue in Soviet-U.S. relations. As you are aware, at issue was a reduction by half of the number of ballistic missiles and as stated at the talks, considerable headway was made in this direction.

In connection with talks on this issue, it goes without saying that also discussed was the role of the ABM Treaty signed in 1972 in Moscow. This is not an easy topic. In one way or another it affects the topic, scarcely pleasant for the U.S. side, of not putting nuclear weapons into space. However, one way or another, the dialogue took place and is to be continued. Another important, I would even say very important, aspect of the Washington talks was the question of reducing conventional types of weapon. This is far from a new issue. Nearly 15 years ago in Vienna, the Austrian capital, a dialogue began between delegations from the NATO and Warsaw Pact Organization member countries. Up to the present time the talks we called at one time the Vienna talks have had no concrete results. In Washington the leaders of both countries looked at the state of affairs and came to the conclusion that military confrontation in the form of conventional weapons must be lowered to the minimum possible. At the press conference, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev indicated that in this sphere there are imbalances and assymetry. If these are to be removed then the whole question will be solved as a unit and the problem may be withdrawn. In the view of the Soviet side it is essential to give the talks a new political boost like that given in Reykjavik on the problems of nuclear weapons. It has to be hoped that this appeal from the Soviet leader will meet with understanding from the United States and their NATO allies.

[Tsoppi] There are many conversations and discussions, all sorts of arguments at the moment, as to the fact that it is possible opposition may also crop up in Congress, that it will be drowned out with the aid of all kinds of provisos, and that there will be fatal provisos too. They're counting how many senators may be in favor and how many against, but it seems to me that there is all the same a healthy majority of some kind in the Senate. [Jim] Wright, let's say, the speaker of the House of Representatives after the Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev meeting, when he assessed the world situation in connection with the treaty and the talks of the leaders of our two countries, said, I think, very precisely: I think that it would be a good thing to have a nonnulcear world and a world in which the overpowering might of weapons was not so great as to swallow a disproportionate amount of the budget and resources. This would be a good thing for all peoples and for the world as a whole. All in all, Wright has calculated, we now have 60,000 nuclear warheads with a total destructive capacity that is a million, a million times greater than the capacity of the bomb that destroyed Hiroshima. The two sides have a destructive power sufficient to annihilate every town on earth and to annihilate one another several times over. One nuclear submarine today has more destructive power than all the bombs dropped on all countries in the years of World War II. This year, the countries of the world are spending nearly $2 billion every day on weapons while at the same time somewhere in the world, 40,000 people die of hunger or because they do not have a simple, cheap vaccine. I think that mankind's reason demands that an end be put to the senseless arms race that is absorbing resources which could have been directed into paying off debts, into improving education and looking for ways to treat diseases. I think then in this confrontation of reason and folly, in this duel as it were between a healthy approach, a sober approach to the world we live in and the world in which we shall be living, and the totally senseless ideas of hegemony some kind of global supremacy, the desire to impose one's will on other peoples with the aid of arms and force, lies the sense of the world's situation, today. And I think that the Washington treaty has, of course, brought reason a serious victory rather than folly.

[Charikov] During his press conference in Washington, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev gave a very high appraisal of the contrubution made by the public of the whole world to the attainment of this success. He said it is our common success, the success of our two countries but at the same time that of our allies and I would have said that he recalled also all those who take part in public organizations throughout the world, who stimulated the politicians of both countries and the political movements of the whole world so that searching for solutions

toward concluding a treaty to scrap nuclear weapons, and above all in this class, did not come to a halt despite all the difficulties and hindrances. These difficulties were genuine and not fabricated, and in many areas these were new problems, particularly in regard to monitoring [kontrol]. In general then, this treaty is the overall result of joint efforts by all the countries and all public movements. I would like to underline one more important result of the visit. It was not expressed in any document or in any spoken accord. It demonstrated that two major world powers adhering to different ideologies and building their societies in their own way are capable of openly conducting dialogue on the most pressing problems that could lead to armed conflict. Without any doubt, the Washington meeting has laid a marvellous basis for an upswing in the sphere of Soviet-U.S. cooperation. This was well understood by all who were following the talks attentively. Not for nothing at the final press conference in Washington did one of the journalists, I don't remember just who now, ask Mikhail Sergeyevich in what specific area in his view progress could take place first: Mikhail Sergeyevich then replied that it was undoubtedly the realm of disarmament and this, without doubt, is the most important sphere. All the rest—cooperation in science and technology, trade and economic links, expanding contacts in the cultural sphere—all these are components of the one important question—disarmament and the gradual elimination of nuclear weapons of all types.

Well then, esteemed comrades, our program has come to an end. On behalf of those taking part I thank you for your attention and say goodbye. Goodbye and all the best.

### Smirnov, Medvedev At Great October Conference

*LD081525 Moscow TASS in English 1250 GMT 8 Dec 87*

[Text] Moscow December 8 TASS—The Great October Revolution and the present is the theme of an international scientific conference that opened in Moscow today. Scholars and public figures from 67 countries arrived in the Soviet capital to attend it.

The conference meets in three main sections in which the Great October Revolution and its influence on world development, the problems of working for peace at the current stage and successes of real socialism are discussed. Several reports are devoted to a new mode of political thinking.

The social, political, democratic, and spiritual potential of the Great October Revolution has far from been used, Georgi Smirnov, director of the Marxism-Leninism Institute at the CPSU Central Committee, said at the opening of the forum. The specific features of the present-day international situation reveal in a new way the world significance of the Great October Revolution. It is noteworthy that it is exactly socialism that has launched the concept of a new mode of political thinking. Guiding by this thinking, mankind can survive in a nuclear age, the scholar added.

The conference of social science experts is in session on the days of the Soviet-U.S. top-level meeting, said Vadim Medvedev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, who delivered a report at the plenary session. He emphasized that the signing of an agreement on medium-range and shorter-range missiles would become the first real breakthrough into a nuclear-free world. This is the first step, which can be followed by other steps, towards a nuclear-free world. This road is not an easy one. We do not have illusions on this score. We realize that a hard struggle is ahead, especially with those who are committed to the arms race policy.

### Medvedev Addresses Session

*LD082310 Moscow TASS in English 1817 GMT 8 Dec 87*

[Text] Moscow December 8 TASS—The ability of humanity to pass through the present-day responsible historic period depends to a considerable extent on the actions of the peace-minded forces. Socialism has an enormous role to play in this respect, Vadim Medvedev has stated. The secretary of the CPSU Central Committee spoke at the international scientific conference "The Great October Revolution and the Present-Day Situation" that opened here today.

He pointed out that the composition of the world had changed dramatically. The task has emerged to fully revive Lenin's concept of socialism without losing the thread of Marxist continuity. Dwelling upon the development of the notion of capitalism, he pointed out that the Soviet social science, and to a certain degree the political practices as well, had proceeded for a long time from obsolete notions. Today it is clear that the replacement of one socio-economic system by another will take place in a broader historic perspective than it was believed before, and the forms of the transfer will be various. Hence the prospect of a long-term coexistence and interaction of the two social systems.

One of the characteristic features of a new stage the socialist system is entering today is the reorganization of relations of socialist countries. Medvedev described out [as received] major positive changes in cooperation of socialist states. Touching upon the development of the notion of the correlation of the basic laws and national peculiarities in socialist development, he emphasized that the strength of socialism consisted in recognizing, taking into account and using numerous forms and national manifestations.

He said that the notion of "global problems" had firmly become part of world politics, the most important of them is the preservation of peace. In this respect the Soviet-American summit meeting which is under way now is of truly historic significance.

The problem of the development of countries that liberated themselves from colonial dependence is another cornerstone of the building of a future world. "We fully side with the peoples fighting for their national liberation and independent economic development, and we are rendering all kinds of assistance to them. At the same time, we come out for the quest for global solutions to the common problems of that part of the world", Medvedev said.

Dwelling upon questions connected with the development of the communist movement, Medvedev pointed out that difficulties on that way were the result of the violation of principles governing inter-party relations that took place in the past. "Now it is really in the past. In our opinion, nothing should prevent communists from exchanging the experience of work, from cooperating with each other more closely", he pointed out.

## Reagan Postsummit Comments, Observations

### Postsummit TV Address

*PM111711 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Dec 87 First Edition p 5*

[TASS report: "Speech by U.S. President"]

[Text] Washington, 11 Dec—U.S. President R. Reagan addressed the nation on nationwide television, noting that the signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles had become "the first but nevertheless important step" toward a more lasting peace. In his words, this is possibly "the most important" step taken since the end of World War II to slow down the arms buildup. He described the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting as "3 historic days" during which efforts were continued "to lay the foundations for improved relations" between the USSR and the United States.

The President emphasized that the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles establishes a new verification regime with "far-reaching consequences." "This is why," the White House chief said, "I believe that this treaty will not only diminish the threat of war. It could also speed up the process which will at some point in time lead to its complete elimination." As Reagan declared, the signing of the agreement on eliminating medium- and shorter-range missiles, together with the other results achieved at the Washington summit, testifies to the "expansion of understanding between the United States and the Soviet Union." "Soviet-U.S. relations are no longer concentrated on just arms control questions. They now cover a much broader agenda." Describing the policy of the USSR and the United States on different issues, the President noted that "if persistence in our efforts on arms reduction has paid off, the human rights question and regional conflicts still constitute problems in our relations."

Now that the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles has been signed, Reagan went on, it will be submitted to the Senate for ratification. "I am convinced that the Senate will now act swiftly to perform its duty in accordance with the Constitution." The President announced his intention to meet congressional leaders as soon as Friday morning.

As the head of the administration stressed, during the frank exchanges of opinions in Washington the leaders of the two countries reached agreement on the need "to redouble efforts aimed at reaching agreement on reducing the arsenal of strategic nuclear arms" belonging to the USSR and the United States in the shortest possible time. "We have issued appropriate instructions to our delegations at the Geneva talks," he added.

At the same time, President Reagan reaffirmed his administration's firm commitment to the "Star Wars" program. "I let it be clearly understood," he said, "that the implementation of our SDI program will continue, and when our system is ready for deployment, we will do precisely that."

Summing up the overall results of the Washington summit, President Reagan reemphasized that progress had been achieved "on every question on our agenda." "Mr Gorbachev and I agreed to continue in a few months' time in Moscow that which has been achieved over the last 3 days. I believe there are grounds for hope and for optimism," he declared.

### Cited on SDI Research

*PM121721 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Dec 87 First Edition p 5*

[TASS report: "High Assessment"]

[Text] Washington, 12 Dec—U.S. President Reagan has held a meeting with the editors of U.S. regional television stations and newspapers in the course of which he made a high assessment of the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit and his talks with M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

The head of the U.S. Administration pointed out that he regards the word "historic" as suitable to describe the Soviet-U.S. treaty which has been signed on the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles. He described the conclusion of the treaty as "the most important action since World War II in the field of arms reduction." "Never before have we had an agreement enshrining the monitoring and verification principles enshrined in the medium-range missile agreement," the President noted.

At the same time, when answering questions linked with the "Strategic Defense Initiative" known as the "Star Wars" program, the U.S. President expressed the view that this program is not an obstacle to talks on the reduction of strategic offensive arms. "We agreed," he stated, "that we can continue [shto prodolzhayem] any necessary research and development, irrespective of any interpretation of the ABM Treaty. On the other hand, we also agreed that there will be a period during which both sides will continue by mutual agreement to observe the ABM Treaty."

### 12 Dec Address to Nation

*LD121933 Moscow TASS in English 1912 GMT 12 Dec 87*

[Text] Washington December 12 TASS—U.S. President Ronald Reagan in his Saturday address to the nation said that for the first time in history in the INF (intermediate-range nuclear force) Treaty "arms control has been replaced by arms reduction".

His discussion of the treaty with congressional leaders, Reagan said, had given cause for believing that it would be ratified by the Senate.

The President said progress had been made also toward 50-percent reductions in strategic nuclear arsenals, but he stressed his administration would not agree to any restrictions on SDI efforts.

Reagan said also that during his meetings with Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, a wide range of problems affecting the interests of both countries and the entire world community had been covered.

### Ratification Meetings Begin

*LD112244 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 11 Dec 87*

[Text] President Reagan had a meeting today with the leaders of the Democratic and Republican Parties in the U.S. Congress and informed them of the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. The same day consultations began between representatives of the Senate and the administration, with the aim of reviewing the treaty eliminating medium- and shorter-range missiles and preparing for the hearings about ratification of the treaty.

## U.S. Views on Treaty, Summit Surveyed

### Congressional Backing Noted

*PM111301 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 10 Dec 87 p 3*

[TASS report: "Historic Breakthrough to Peace. The United States: Broad Approval"]

[Text] Washington—In an interview with NBC-TV a leading member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Richard Lugar, indicated that the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles contains provisions on reliable monitoring. Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee Sam Nunn noted that the majority of Americans supports the treaty and this circumstance will undoubtedly have an important influence on the outcome of the Senate debates when the question of ratifying this agreement is being discussed. Both senators, however, have not excluded the possibility of the introduction of amendments and clauses to the treaty, stressing here that they will scarcely be binding.

Robert Byrd, leader of the Democratic majority in the Senate, stated: "I am acquainted with the text of the treaty and I believe there are favorable prospects for its ratification. At present I do not foresee anything which could create serious problems." This agreement, Democratic Senator Alan Cranston stressed, accords with the interests of the peoples of all countries and can serve as a stimulus to the achievement of significant progress in the strengthening of peace on earth.

The organizations "Women of the World and Parliamentarians for Peace" and "Women for a Successful Summit" have given their firm support to the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles.

### U.S. Conservatives Viewed

*PM111433 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Dec 87 Morning Edition p 2*

[Report by special correspondents N. Yefimov, S. Kondrashov, and A. Palladin: "The Time Has Come for the Next Step"]

[Text] Washington—The meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan lasted just 3 days and, if you are going to be strictly accurate, M.S. Gorbachev has spent precisely 75 hours in the U.S. capital and on U.S. soil. This meager period of time dictates the pace at which the events are being covered. But because of the time difference these observations of ours will reach the reader when the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting has ended and the Soviet guest has left Washington. Also, of course, newspaper reporters are in some way behind their colleagues in television.

On the other hand, however, our colleagues with the television cameras make our work easier. You, the reader, have already seen the pictures. Probably the most important event was when the two leaders signed the treaty in the East Room of the White House—a treaty reached by the two powers with such difficulty. Yes, the road has not been easy, progress has been erratic, and there have been some reverses. But patience and hard work always win through in the end, as they say—if this is accompanied by political wisdom, goodwill, and the art of mutual understanding.

So, solemnly bound in leather, the treaty will now go to the two countries' legislative organs to be ratified. Without risk of error, one can assume that the process of ratification will be less complicated and prolonged in the USSR Supreme Soviet than in the U.S. Senate, where the Foreign Relations Committee will begin discussing the treaty on 19 January and where it must eventually be approved by a two-thirds vote—no fewer than 67 of the 100 senators. Will this actually happen, in a country where political life is very volatile and the last Soviet-U.S. Treaty—SALT II—remained unratified? This question will have to be studied by journalists and especially politicians over and over in order to reach a definitive conclusion. But if we go on the present distribution of forces, the majority of people in the know here in Washington agree on one thing: It will happen.

According to various predictions, between 10-15 and 20-25 senators will risk openly opposing the treaty, which has the support of 4 out of 5 Americans. Particularly as the elections are just around the corner, when the votes of these Americans will be extremely necessary to many senators. Particularly when the treaty has been concluded on the directives of a President whom it is virtually impossible to accuse of being "soft on communism" although, as is well-known, the far right has now gone against its idol.

Newspaper reporters cannot keep pace with events in these few, brief days when the Soviet leader is moving swiftly through his hectic, extremely full schedule of talks with the U.S. President and other meetings and contacts. But M.S. Gorbachev's visit is not one of those events whose full import can be assessed on the spot. Who could have foreseen from the Reykjavik summit meeting in October last year the present, December summit here in Washington and the moment when two very different people would sit down at a table in the White House to sign a document proving the success of their dialogue with all the eyes of the world upon them?

The summit meeting here in Washington was preceded by a clamorous overture. It broke all the rules of musical harmony and was more like a cacophony: The human chain of peace campaigners and the hysterical reaction of the far right to Reagan's observation that their opposition to the treaty is obviously due to their acceptance of the inevitability of war; prayers for the success of the Soviet-U.S. talks; veterans embracing one another at their meeting on the Elbe; noisy demonstrations in the U.S. capital demanding exit visas for virtually every Jew living in the Soviet Union, without asking them whether they want this or not; and the newspaper headline in letters a mile high: "Glasnost Spells Danger." All this and much more represents the opposites and extremes of American life with its surface currents and undercurrents.

But the overture came to an end, and on the day of the Soviet guest's arrival the press and television assumed a different tone following the administration's lead—optimistic expectation. "Promise of a New Era in U.S.-Soviet Relations"—this bold statement came from the capital's leading newspaper, THE WASHINGTON POST. "The Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev is arriving for a summit meeting with President R. Reagan amid growing belief that the superpowers are ready for a new era," said the conservative WALL STREET JOURNAL.

The signed treaty is now a fait accompli. Universal attention is now being given to what is "on the table"—the hard work by the two leaders and the members of their delegations. Although the talks are being held behind closed doors, their subject is no secret. The third summit meeting will primarily be judged by how close it comes to solving the key task of achieving a 50% cut in the strategic offensive weapons which constitute the main nuclear arsenals of the two powers. How powerful a boost will be given here to the talks on this problem? Will a new, more important treaty be ready by the time R. Reagan pays a return visit to Moscow in spring or early summer next year?

Time demands that we hurry because the fruits of this difficult dialogue must ripen fairly quickly if we consider that R. Reagan has only 1 year left in the White House. The first answer to the questions raised will be given immediately after the meeting ends, at a news conference by M.S. Gorbachev before his departure. The final answer will only be given by time itself.

Too much divides our countries for us to give way to euphoria even in the present atmosphere of excitement in Washington. If euphoria has found a place in Soviet-U.S. relations, it is on shaky ground and cannot last very long. Apart from anything else, such issues as Afghanistan and regional conflicts as well as a thoughtful or speculative attitude to human rights are on the negotiating table.

But we would like to stress once again that there has not been such a propitious combination of circumstances for a long time, perhaps never.

The hysteria whipped up on the eve of the visit by U.S. conservative forces was noisy but failed to elicit a broad response or sympathy. Yes, Americans as a nation still do not trust the Soviet Union (we should not flatter ourselves on this score), but they no longer panic about a Soviet threat. This phenomenon has been remarked upon by serious journalists here who made an in-depth study of public opinion before the summit meeting.

The dividing line in U.S. public opinion is common sense, one might say. On one side remain those for whom their principled, indeed fanatical refusal to come to any agreement with the Soviet Union is a "question of conscience" turned inside out. Many conservatives, incidentally, are in the other camp—on the side of common sense. They are people who until quite recently were considered incorrigible, inveterate opponents of Soviet-U.S. dialogue. The attitude to the Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles has proved to be the litmus test. Who do you think is responsible for the following quotation: "The conclusion of the treaty sets a precedent for cooperation and creates a more constructive climate for U.S.-Soviet relations. This may prove useful for the future, particularly if we can learn from this experience"? Jeane Kirkpatrick, former U.S. representative to the United Nations, the embodiment of a hardline attitude to the Soviet Union. No, we have not converted her to our faith. By our persistency, flexibility, and readiness for mutual compromise taking the balance of interests into account we have persuaded her that she can do business with Moscow. Her—and Reagan.

IZVESTIYA correspondents met the other day with Richard Perle, former U.S. assistant defense secretary, who is nicknamed the "prince of darkness" because he is perhaps the most rabid opponent of arms control talks. So what did Perle say this time? He thinks that the treaty should and will be ratified. These are his very words: "I believe that our countries will benefit from this treaty." And "I would like to hope that the example set by this treaty will move people closer to understanding and that we will be able to achieve serious, substantial agreements with far-reaching consequences." Why has the "prince of darkness" begun to talk like this? Even many Americans we spoke to said that there are signs that a process of differentiation is taking place among conservatives in the United States.

But we would not like the "prince of darkness" to have the last word. In our opinion, the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting is dispelling the darkness and bringing light and hope: the very things all of us need so much.

### U.S. Public Reaction Cited

*LD132233 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 13 Dec 87*

[From the "International Panorama" program, presented by IZVESTIYA Political Observer Vitaliy Kobysh, with Vladimir Dunayev in Washington]

[Excerpts] [Kobysh] Hello Comrades! Naturally we begin our latest International Panorama with the events to which all attention was riveted over the last few days—the visit to Washington by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and his talks with U.S. President Ronald Reagan. It is true that great things can be best seen from afar. But in order to assess the significance for humanity's future of the signing by the Soviet and U.S. leaders of the treaty which immediately did away with two classes of nuclear weapons—medium- and shorter-range missiles—the distance of time is not needed. This is an event of historic scale. Its meaning is simple but so far it is hard to fit into the consciousness. Humanity has entered the age of the destruction of nuclear weapons; it has started down the road leading to a nuclear-free world. No, all our efforts did not turn out to be in vain; it was not for nothing that the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee proposed to the U.S. President that they meet at first at Geneva and then at Reykjavik. These meetings laid the foundation for signing the Washington treaty. But our correspondent will tell us how all this was seen in Washington. [video shows clip of opening sequence of NBC television newscast]

[Dunayev] This how the U.S. television news began on all the days of the visit. This is the NBC television network broadcast—the news anchorman is Tom Brokow. [passage omitted]

I don't know if the U.S. press will retain their memory of the treaty, of the packed avenues where Washingtonians greeted Comrade Gorbachev on the sidewalk. But however the press and television behaved, the Americans will retain a good feeling from that December week. See the drawings children send to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev! [video shows picture by U.S. schoolchild] [passage omitted]

[Kobysh] In Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's 3 days' stay in Washington much still happened. We have heard from the U.S. President not only the sayings he has learned in Russian but also his words of adherence to a nuclear-free world, his endeavor to cooperate with our country; words which were hard to tie in with Ronald Reagan's statements of the early 1980s, statements where he said that the Soviet Union was the evil empire, that he intended to organize a crusade against Socialism. So the times change, and we change together with them. Has Ronald Reagan changed? We are not going to guess. Something else is quite clear. America has changed; the mood of her citizens, who now like all people on earth call for an elimination of the nuclear threat, an end to the arms race. This facilitated to a significant degree the success of the talks by the Soviet and U.S. leaders on another problem which will be even more important in future—the 50% reduction by the two countries of their strategic offensive weapons. Let us realize, Comrades, how joyfully people will breathe if agreement can be reached on this. How much shorter and straighter will be the path to a nuclear free world!

## Further Soviet Reportage, Comment on Summit

### Summit 'First Real Step'

*PM111325 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Dec 87 Second Edition p 3*

[Special correspondents V. Gan, Ye. Grigoryev, and T. Kolesnichenko dispatch: "Winter on the Wane"]

[Text] Washington, 10 Dec—We are transmitting this dispatch on the last day of the CPSU Central Committee general secretary's stay on U.S. soil. The time difference between Moscow and Washington prevents us from covering the Soviet leader's news conference scheduled according to the visit's program. Now everyone is impatiently awaiting his conclusions, his summing up, and his assessment of future prospects.

The Soviet-U.S. summit meeting is becoming part of history. The experts and researchers have still to pass a final verdict on these 3 days in December in the U.S. capital. In our view, however, it is already possible to say that the Washington dialogue is not just another meeting between the Soviet and U.S. leaders in the wake of Geneva and Reykjavik, but a qualitatively new link in the development of Soviet-U.S. relations.

Key problems of war and peace provided the basis for talks in Geneva, an examination of the actual possibilities for real disarmament took place in Reykjavik, and now these possibilities have materialized for the first time. But even if Washington had produced nothing but the signing of the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles, from our viewpoint this alone would have been sufficient to ensure that the meeting went down in the annals of history as the first real step along the path to nuclear disarmament.

It is hard to overestimate the treaty's importance. It was immediately described as historic and unique. For a long time now there have been no serious disarmament agreements between our two powers. Thus, a qualitative development has now taken place in Soviet-U.S. relations, whose core consists of security problems. This development is of fundamental importance not only for our two countries but also for the security of all peoples. After all, the first, long-awaited step along the path to a nuclear-free world has been taken.

How many missiles will be destroyed? On the Soviet side, 826 medium-range and 929 shorter-range missiles. On the U.S. side, 689 and 170 respectively. These are the most up-to-date weapons, weapons which previously people always tried to preserve and multiply.

The actual procedure of elimination is far from simple. Some of the missiles, without the warheads of course, will be destroyed by launching them. Warheads will be eliminated separately. A truly unique verification system has been elaborated to monitor implementation of the treaty. It provides for both the utilization of national technical means and the conduct of inspections. Subject to agreement, verification measures will be extended also to the European countries (seven of them) where the two sides' medium- and shorter-range missiles are now sited. The joint experience to be accumulated in the course of this work will be of great value. It could be especially useful when it comes to the reduction of strategic offensive arms.

During the 3 days of the visit, our files have acquired dozens of clippings from the U.S. press. Quotations are nice, but personal impressions are even better: They make it possible to give a direct sense of the atmosphere in these historic days.

Day 2, for example. It started early—M.S. Gorbachev met U.S. congressional leaders at 0900 hours. The conversation with the legislators was highly important. In mid-January the White House must officially submit the text of the agreement to three Senate committees—the Armed Services Committee, the Committee on Intelligence, and the Foreign Relations Committee. Following this, in mid-March according to legislators' expectations, the treaty will be submitted to the Senate so that the ratification process can be concluded by summer.

"What are your impressions from this morning's conversation with M.S. Gorbachev?", we asked Senator R. Dole. "We discussed the entire package of questions—from the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles to the situation in Afghanistan and Central America and human rights problems," he replied. "I had a brief one-to-one conversation with M.S. Gorbachev. The Soviet leader certainly is a very dynamic person who has been well-briefed for the Washington summit. He is exceptionally convincing in presenting his views to the U.S. public."

We asked the same question of Democratic Majority Leader Senator R. Byrd. "I believe," the senator said, "that the progress which the USSR and the United States have managed to achieve along many avenues of contemporary world politics have been made possible by the energy and persistence of the CPSU Central Committee general secretary. I took the opportunity to give him my views on a number of problems in USSR-U.S. relations."

But what do ordinary Americans think? Here are two notes taken on 16th Street, where the Soviet Embassy and M.S. Gorbachev's residence are located.

The first conversation was with 58-year old bus driver Frank Buiz. He drives the journalists accredited to the meeting. "I also feel a participant in all that's happening," he said. Of course, I can't say that I'm very well versed in politics. But as regards my personal attitude to Mr Gorbachev, it is most favorable." [quotation marks as received]

Ted Mongtret [as published] works in a law firm. He is 43. "From a lawyer's angle," he noted, "the U.S.-Soviet treaty that was signed yesterday is a good accord from all viewpoints. I believe that it marks the beginning of a long-term process of eliminating nuclear arms."

The treaty attuned the U.S. public and the whole world to the expectation of promising results in the sphere of offensive arms reduction. Here is what THE NEW YORK TIMES wrote yesterday: "During these 3 days R. Reagan and M. Gorbachev could reach an even more significant agreement—to lay the foundations for a 50% reduction of strategic nuclear arsenals. Indeed, the idea of such an agreement has turned from an unattainable dream into perfectly reasonable expectations. Not to live up to these expectations would mean dashing the hopes of many!"

We would like to draw our readers' attention to the fact that this was not said by an antiwar organization's leaflet or a left-wing press organ. It was written by a respectable bourgeois newspaper, one could even say the mouthpiece of ruling and business America, of its "upper" class. What does it indicate? If nothing else it indicates, we believe, how important Soviet-U.S. summit meetings are if, as a result of them, the winter of our discontent is on

the wane, squeezing out the "frost" of confrontation by a constructive quest for ways to normalize Soviet-U.S. relations and improve the international situation as a whole.

During these days Washington produced yet another confirmation of the idea that there can be no victors in a nuclear war, nor can there be "vanquished" in this type of talks. The only winners are reason, common sense, and the interests of peace.

This has been realized by sober-minded America. Unfortunately, not all of America is sober-minded. The faces of the adversaries of Soviet-U.S. dialogue—Haig, Weinberger, Perle, and countless others—are constantly on the television screens nowadays, pursuing their line: Beware the Russians, they say: They will cheat for sure, they cannot be trusted. The same old story: Americans are the "good guys," the Russians are the "bad guys." All that is good for the USSR is bad for the United States, and vice versa.

Even though it is clear that such a political platform can lead only to the abyss of nuclear catastrophe, conservative extremists nevertheless prefer to stick to it. Senator Jesse Helms refused to attend the ceremony of the signing of the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles. Some 20 senators are threatening to frustrate the treaty's ratification in the Senate, while various leaders of anti-Soviet campaigns are muddying the waters. This situation must not be underestimated. U.S. reactionary circles have been dealt a blow which has knocked them down. But they are far from knocked out and will no doubt try to exact revenge by destroying the shoots of trust between our countries' peoples. They will probably try to make their compatriots forget these days in Washington, when a breath of spring breeze was felt at the height of the December winter.

### Morozov on 'Balance of Interests'

*PM111455 Moscow TRUD in Russian 11 Dec 87 p 3*

[Interview with Military Observer Colonel V. Morozov by unnamed correspondent under the rubric "From the Military Viewpoint": "Balance of Security"]

[Text] A TRUD correspondent put this question to Military Observer Colonel V. Morozov: Is the fact that the Soviet Union is eliminating more missiles of two classes than the United States not a considerable concession by the Soviet side?

This is what Col Morozov replied:

According to the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles, the Soviet Union is indeed eliminating more missiles. Thus, 826 medium-range missiles—deployed and not deployed—are to be eliminated in the USSR (including 470 deployed missiles).

As for shorter-range missiles, the Soviet side will eliminate 926 deployed and undeployed missiles, and the U.S. side 170 such missiles. Thus, the USSR is eliminating a sum total of 1,752 missiles, and the United States 859 missiles. As regards operationally deployed medium-range missiles [razvernutyye na boyevykh pozitsiyakh sredniye rakety], which constitute the most dangerous destabilizing means, both sides are physically destroying roughly the same number of missiles (470 and 429).

The fears of people unversed in these matters that we might have been "outdone" by the United States must be dispelled. Let us state bluntly: No. It is, in the final analysis, not a question of arithmetic but of a balance of interests, a balance of security.

If we take this side of the question, that is, the military aspect, it has to be said that the security of neither of the contracting sides has suffered. On the contrary. Both sides have won, because, according to the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles, what is being eliminated on both sides is the most destabilizing, most dangerous, most provocative missiles which, in relation to the USSR, are strategic. In the past the not unknown U.S. military figures Rogers and Lehman bragged that their first-strike missiles stationed in West Europe were targeted directly... on Moscow. Now this threat will be removed.

So we must speak not only and not so much about a balance of forces but about a balance of interests, a balance of equal security.

Now about another side of the military aspect of the treaty. It clearly formulates the methods of eliminating the missiles, including the nuclear warheads themselves. This is stated in detail in the published documents. Here it is important to emphasize one aspect: The nuclear warheads are being removed from the missiles to be destroyed, while the fissionable material is being removed from them and will be used by both sides at their discretion. Let us add that after appropriate processing this material (a costly nuclear substance!) can be used in reactors at nuclear power stations.

### Gontar Cited on Implementation

*LD111623 Moscow TASS in English 1612 GMT 11 Dec 87*

[Text] Moscow December 11 TASS—A TASS diplomatic correspondent reports:

It was with great approval that people of goodwill everywhere regarded the signing of the treaty in Washington on the elimination of Soviet and U.S. intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, history's first agreement scrapping two classes of nuclear arms at once.

Major General Philipp Gontar, an expert at the USSR Ministry of Defence, has told the correspondent that the implementation of the treaty will become a kind of

breakthrough along the road of nuclear disarmament, and that it opens up a prospect for a radical reduction in strategic offensive arms with the maintenance of and strict compliance with the ABM Treaty.

Under the treaty, 826 Soviet deployed and non-deployed intermediate-range missiles and 689 similar U.S. ones are to be eliminated. As far as shorter-range missiles (with a range of 500 to 1,000 km) are concerned, the Soviet Union will eliminate 926 deployed and non-deployed missiles and the United States will scrap 170 such missiles.

The intermediate-range missiles are subject to elimination within a period of three years after the treaty's entry into force. Both the Soviet Union and the United States shall begin the missile elimination process simultaneously on a proportionate basis so as to observe the original ratio of missiles being eliminated. Shorter-range missiles shall be eliminated within 18 months.

Subject to elimination together with the missiles are their nuclear warheads, including 72 U.S. warheads which are intended for the West German Pershing-1A missiles. Sites, to be specially agreed upon by the parties, shall be designated for the elimination of missile systems. There will be eight such sites in the Soviet Union and two in the United States.

"Much importance in the treaty is attached to effective verification of the parties' strict compliance with the treaty provisions throughout the entire period of the elimination of the intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, as well as in the course of subsequent ten years", General Gontar pointed out.

"Provision is made for verification both by national technical means and through on-site inspections. The total number of inspections which the Soviet Union may conduct in the course of 13 years on the territories of the United States and West European countries (the Federal Republic of Germany, Britain, Italy, Belgium, and the Netherlands) is approximately 240. The United States, for its part, may conduct about 400 inspections on the territories of the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, and the German Democratic Republic".

The treaty envisages the following kinds of inspections:

-Initial data inspections beginning 30 days and completed no later than 90 days after entry into force of this treaty;

-Inspections to verify the elimination of missile operating bases and missile support facilities. These shall be conducted within the period of the elimination of the intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, i.e. in the course of three years;

-Inspections to verify non-production of missiles at manufacturing plants (one for each party). Such inspections shall be carried out on a permanent continuous basis while inspections to verify non-production of ballistic and cruise-missile launchers shall be carried out within the framework of established quotas;

-Inspections at the sites of the elimination of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, the launchers of such missiles, and support equipment;

-And, finally, inspections on a quota basis to be carried out in the course of 13 years at all missile operating bases and missile support facilities (with the exception of facilities for the production of missiles).

"The Soviet Union and the United States each have a right to conduct 20 such inspections a year within the first three years following the entry of the treaty into force, and respectively 15 and 10 such inspections a year within the subsequent first and second five-year periods".

The protocol on inspections contains as follows:

-The parties' obligations concerning a procedure for sending notifications about an intention to conduct an inspection as well as obligations of the inspecting and inspected parties in view of such notifications;

-A procedure for the entry, reception and transportation of inspectors to the inspected site, including a procedure for the use of monitoring equipment;

-General rules for conducting an inspection, and so on.

"A procedure for conducting inspections on the territories of the Soviet Union's and the United States' allied basing countries is to be determined on the strength of agreements with them to implement the appropriate Soviet-U.S. accords on the inspections issue".

"In order to promote the attainment of the goals and the provisions of the signed treaty, the parties agreed to set up a special monitoring commission".

"The commission's meetings which will be held at the request of any of the parties are to tackle issues pertaining to the fulfillment of the obligations as well as to coordinate measures which are necessary to enhance the vitality and efficiency of the treaty".

"An important role in the INF Treaty is assigned to the nuclear risk reduction centres which are to ensure permanent contacts between the parties. All notifications, requests and decisions on inspections will pass through them".

"Thus, the signed treaty provides for a whole package of necessary measures to ensure reliable and effective verification of the implementation of its provisions", General Gontar emphasized.

### Glazunov on Treaty, Future

*LD121744 Moscow World Service in English 1410 GMT 12 Dec 87*

[Commentary by Political Observer Viktor Glazunov]

[Text] As I recall the events of the 3 memorable days in Washington I invariably think about the ceremony in the East Room of the White House when the treaty was signed to abolish two classes of nuclear missiles. That ceremony was unprecedented in history. The leaders of the two superpowers put their signatures to the first treaty on real disarmament. Times move and everything changes. Even the ancient Greeks used to say that, but such fast moving times, such rapid changes in the world as the current ones were never recorded in history before.

When in January 1986 Mikhail Gorbachev offered a program of building a nuclear-free world by the year 2000, the reaction of many people was that it was a utopia, an illusion. In October that year the Reykjavik summit showed that a nuclear-free world is not an illusion but a reality close at hand, provided there is a political will to act to achieve it. This December there has been a display of that political will by the Soviet and U.S. leaders to open the door to a nuclear-free world by agreeing on the first step along that path.

The treaty scrapping two classes of nuclear missiles has been devised just like that, as the beginning and not as an isolated document. Another treaty is expected to follow. Strategic armaments were the central topic of the talks between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan in Washington. Both leaders admitted this is the main issue of the Soviet-American relations, an issue that certainly worries the world community because it is the central problem of nuclear disarmament. If the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles is to eliminate 4-5% of the Soviet and American nuclear arsenals, the new treaty should cut strategic armaments in half. And those armaments make up about 95% of all the nuclear explosives of the two countries.

In that way the nuclear burden of humanity would be reduced by half all at once. Half a million Hiroshimas will stop threatening the nations. That was the major breakthrough the Soviet and American leaders dealt with at their Washington meeting.

It was noted in the joint Soviet-American statement on the results of the meeting that considerable progress has been made towards concluding a treaty to apply the principles of a 50% cut. The leaders of the two countries agreed to tell a newly-set up group of experts to prepare a coordinated draft of instructions to the Soviet and American delegations in Geneva. On that basis a treaty would be worked out to reduce in half the strategic armaments with observance of the antiballistic treaty and no withdrawal from it for an agreed period of time. The treaty should be worked out by the time of the visit to the USSR by President Reagan in the first half of next year so (?that) the two leaders can sign the treaty.

Of course, there is a lot of work ahead, but I repeat that definite accords have already been reached and (?are) results of some joint experiences, the signing of the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles. So much so that even THE NEW YORK TIMES, usually cautious in its estimates in that area, said in a comment on the Washington summit that the idea of a 50% cut in strategic armaments had turned from a daydream into quite reasonable expectations. That conclusion is momentous since this newspaper, unlike any other, is aware of the obstacles influential quarters in the United States are trying to put up on the path towards the new treaty. For example, Senator Steve Syms said recently it was most important not to let the agreement on strategic armaments to be signed.

There are obvious difficulties ahead. It is also obvious that prospects have opened up. After the Soviet-American summit in Washington, a nuclear-free world has been brought closer. A powerful impetus has been given to the movement in that direction. Time has come for well-justified hopes that the nuclear genie will be finally coped with.

### 'Danger' of Nonratification

*LD130140 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2050 GMT 12 Dec 87*

[From the "Look Around" program presented by journalists Dmitriy Zakharov, Aleksandr Lyubimov, and Vladislav Listev, with Political Observer Vladimir Pozner]

[Text] [Listev] Vladimir Vladimirovich, you are just back from the United States and, naturally, we have questions for you about the negotiations that took place and the meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan. What is your personal attitude toward the events that took place in Washington?

[Pozner] Well, it is difficult to say it right away, but, well, these words have perhaps worn a little thin by now, but nevertheless, watching it I had a feeling that I indeed was seeing history, simply an historic event taking place. You cannot get away from it, it sticks in your mind. A sense of pride, because, say what you like, but what took place there was brought about in the main through the efforts of our country, in my view, of our leadership. You know, giving up that number of warheads, four times more than the Americans, well, that is evidence of new thinking, you see, it needed some kind of new approach. To witness that, as I have said, gives you a sense of pride and conviction that you have just seen history in the making.

[Zakharov] Nonetheless, despite readiness on both sides to go halfway, as Marlin Fitzwater put it in part, in the Senate there is a certain group of people, who want to torpedo the ratification of the treaty planned for April. Do you...

[Listev, interrupting] That is, someone does not want it. Is the story of SALT-II—when a treaty already signed was not ratified—going to repeat itself?

[Zakharov] That is it.

[Pozner] Well, there is such a danger. But it seems to me that the treaty after all ought to be ratified. There is a group that is against it. There is another group, perhaps much larger, that says we should ratify it but with all sorts of amendments. These amendments might even alter the treaty so much that it would be unacceptable to us. So we cannot say there is no danger.

This danger, by the way, is illustrated by significant activity by the right-wingers. I have brought along two copies of THE WASHINGTON TIMES newspaper. It is a fairly well-known paper. It is sufficiently reactionary but has a large circle of readers. They, these right-wingers, so to speak, buy columns of, say, this kind: an appeal to the Senate. Further on they enumerate facts. Such facts, of course, that we have always violated all treaties that there have ever been...

[Listev, interrupting] According to them?

[Pozner] That is right, that we have 1 and 1/2 billion slaves, and so on, just about everything. It goes: fact, fact, fact. Further on: Stop the INF Treaty. So this is one example of that kind of appeal. Here is another example, this time in Russian.

[Listev] They have already started to use Russian script?

[Pozner] That is right. Here you are: Soviet glasnost is a danger to everyone. [laughter] Here, at the bottom: Down with Soviet slavery—Russia needs freedom, well, this appeal is from, as they say, Americans of Russian origin. By far not all the Americans of Russian origin are like that...

[Listev, interrupting] That is almost downright monarchic.

[Pozner] I would not say anarchic but rather...

[Listev, interrupting] No, no, I said monarchic.

[Pozner] Yes, that is right, monarchic, undoubtedly. This indicates that there is danger. Although, their loud noise most likely indicates that they are losing at the moment. That is why they are shouting and protesting so loudly, but we cannot, of course, say that everything has been resolved and everything is all right.

[Lyubimov] Well, I would like to balance Vladimir's skepticism with optimism, because I believe that the treaty will be ratified.

[Listev] I also hope so.

[Lyubimov] How, in fact, are these missiles going to be destroyed? We keep on talking about some sort of incineration, of burning out, there are all these terms around.

[Pozner] Right, as they say, it is easier to wreck than to build, although in this case it is not all that easy. The treaty itself cites detailed methods for missile destruction. It seems, perhaps, that the best method is to launch the missiles, without warheads, of course, and when they fall into the ocean, on passing through the dense layers of the atmosphere they would simply burn up completely and thus would not pose any danger to people or the environment. Because there is also the method of blowing up the missiles, again without their warheads, well, incinerating them, blowing them up. But the combustion products from these missiles are not at all pleasant for the environment. It is worked out in great detail there how this is going to take place, with both sides observing, of course, and so on.

[Listev] I think it is highly symbolic that we are sitting here now and talking not about missiles—who has more and who has less—but about how they are going to be destroyed. I think that previously this would have been quite hard to imagine.

[Pozner] We could go even further and say that never in the history of mankind have two countries agreed to destroy any kind of weapon, be it bow and arrows, swords, or what you like. All in all, this is the first time in history that it is taking place. So it is worth remembering at all times.

[Zakharov] Especially as the Pershing-2 missiles, made by the Martin Marietta company, are a very young weapon. They have been produced only recently.

[Pozner] Well.

[Lybimov] Vladimir Vladimirovich, we would like to invite you to go on participating in our program, although it is a dubious honor. [laughter]

[Pozner] Thank you very much. But the point is that I came back only yesterday and I do have a family back home, my wife, children, and even a grandaughter. So if it is all the same to you I will participate some other time, but now I would like to go home.

[Listev] Yes, of course. We are very sorry. [laughter]

[Pozner] All the same, thank you very much. Goodnight.

[Listev] Goodnight. All the best. All the best to you. [Video shows Pozner with the three journalists in the "Look Around" studio; Pozner showing copies of THE WASHINGTON TIMES with full-page advertisements by the Conservative Victory Committee and the Freedom for Russia Association]

### Ovchinnikov: 'Watershed'

*PM131921 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Dec 87 First Edition p 6*

[Article by Political Observer Vsevolod Ovchinnikov: "Watershed"]

[Text] The Soviet-U.S. meeting in Washington could go down in history as a turning point in the fate of mankind, as a watershed between the era of the growth of the nuclear threat and the era of the demilitarization of our planet. In M.S. Gorbachev's words, it has now been acknowledged at the highest level that the USSR and the United States are emerging from protracted confrontation and are ready to leave it behind. The treaty on the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles signed by the leaders of the two countries makes it possible to take the first step toward a nuclear-free world. The significance of the treaty extends far beyond the bounds of its specific content. It gives the peoples the chance of getting onto the road away from disaster. This sapling is capable of turning into a mighty tree of peace if those who hate it do not succeed in trampling it underfoot.

A qualitative shift has undoubtedly taken place in Soviet-U.S. relations, of which security questions form the crux. The question is how fully its positive consequences can be utilized. The treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles has good chances of ratification. But it also has opponents in the U.S. Senate who have by no means laid down their arms. If they have failed to prevent the treaty being signed they would at least like to obstruct its coming into force and thereby wreck the subsequent even bigger steps mapped out by the participants in the Washington meeting.

I am referring primarily to to the main problem in Soviet-U.S. relations—the radical reduction of strategic offensive arms. The experience accumulated in elaborating the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles has turned out to be a valuable aid here, although a great deal of work still lies ahead to reach a treaty on the elimination of practically half the strategic offensive weapons in existence by the time of the U.S. President's return visit to the USSR. There is also the possibility of agreement on a considerable reduction in troops and conventional arms in Europe. If all this happens, it will be possible to say that the progress toward a nuclear-free world has become irreversible.

With the conquest of new heights, other topical problems—the elimination of chemical weapons and the cessation of nuclear tests—have begun to look different, acquired urgency, and commanded increased attention. As the same time the question of asymmetry and imbalance between various classes of arms and armed forces has become more acute as progress has been made. Justified anxiety, misapprehensions, and prejudices all constitute the reason for this. Washington "hawks," for example, are alleging that the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles is a victory for Moscow. It is alleged that U.S. missiles capable of hitting the territory of the USSR will be destroyed whereas Soviet medium- and shorter-range missiles cannot reach the United States.

Under the treaty signed 8 December the Soviet Union is to destroy 826 medium-range missiles and 926 shorter-range missiles, and the United States 689 medium-range missiles and 170 shorter-range missiles. As the CPSU Central Committee general secretary noted at his meeting with U.S. congressional leaders, many Soviet people are asking: Is the USSR leadership doing the right thing in agreeing to eliminate more weapons than the U.S. side? It is easy to understand such anxiety. In the process of the ratification of the treaty in the Supreme Soviet it will have to be explained why Moscow decided to do this out of a desire to get the cause of nuclear disarmament moving. In this case the algebra of politics transcends the arithmetic of weapons, and without detriment to the security of the USSR and its allies. Once again the Soviet Union has graphically demonstrated its commitment to the new thinking, paving the way to agreement in an area where it was not weaker but stronger.

At the same time, all the indications are that some people in the West are not averse to elevating the principle of "asymmetry" to some kind of absolute—that is, interpreting the flexibility and initiative-taking of Soviet foreign policy as a readiness for unilateral concessions. In a television interview beamed to Western Europe U.S. Assistant Secretary of State Rozanne Ridgway unambiguously stated: "In the medium-range missile agreement we achieved asymmetrical reductions, and I think that quite obviously this creates a precedent for talks on nonnuclear arms."

I am convinced that Western politicians who adhere to such a one-sided approach are mistaken. The Soviet Union and the United States indeed have different structures for their armed forces in general and nuclear arms in particular. But this asymmetry developed historically or, to put it more accurately, was imposed on us. In Washington there is an inclination to describe Soviet ground-based ICBM's as the most "destabilizing" type of arms. But the reasons why they became the basis of the USSR's strategic nuclear forces are common knowledge.

Back in the forties and fifties the United States encircled the Soviet Union with a ring of military bases, whereas our country had to resist the U.S. threat from its own territory. This factor still exists today. Soviet nuclear weapons are deployed on Soviet soil, (with the exception of a small number of operational-tactical missiles in

the GDR and the CSSR which are subject to elimination under the Washington treaty). But the United States has 1,500 military bases in 32 foreign countries and keeps 510,000 servicemen—more than one-fourth of its armed forces—outside the country.

It is not difficult to understand why U.S. representatives are so persistent in seeking an "asymmetrical approach" to the reduction of strategic offensive arms. For if the Soviet Union were to abandon its essential [neobkhodimyy] advantage in heavy ballistic missiles this would, first, make U.S. territory less vulnerable (while the threat to the Soviet Union from the large number of missiles on U.S. submarines would persist) and, second, increase the significance of the forward-based U.S. means moved up toward Soviet borders.

While acknowledging the NATO countries' concern with the tanks confronting them in central Europe, it is also necessary, in my view, to take into consideration our concern at the combat means at U.S. military bases abroad and also at NATO's considerable superiority in forces on the southern flank of Europe.

The U.S. press recently carried a noteworthy report: The Joint Chiefs of Staff have instructed U.S. Strategic Air Command to determine what nuclear weapons can plug the "gap" in West European defenses following the elimination of the medium-range missiles. It is proposed to entrust this task to B-52 bombers carrying cruise missiles or FB-111 bombers. The winter session of the NATO Council just held in Brussels actively discussed the question of how to replace the U.S. systems which are to be destroyed. It is proposed that F-16 fighter-bombers be stationed instead of cruise missiles near the Belgian town of Florennes, and there are plans to transfer more U.S. missile-carrying submarines to the NATO zone. As can be seen, NATO strategists are not averse to "compensating" for the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles by building up U.S. forward-based means. This kind of "asymmetry" is indeed worth talking about.

The opponents of any accords with the Soviet Union whatsoever assert that the threat of war is created not by military might but by political confrontation. Since different social systems exist, they claim, antagonism between them is inevitable.

But historical experience in no way testifies that the existence of two systems gives rise to the fatal inevitability of a military clash between them. World War I broke out before real socialism even existed. During World War II the United States and other capitalist poweres were allies of the motherland of socialism in the anti-Hitler coalition. For all their differences in terms of world outlook, political system, and way of life, there is no way the peoples of the USSR and the United States can get away from each other, as was noted in the course of the visit. They will have to be partners while remaining rivals. "It takes two to tango," people in Washington are fond of saying. But surely they don't have to be identical twins? They hardly make an ideal couple! Let us not forget that the unity of opposites is an integral part of dialectics.

During the 3 packed days of the visit the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee carried out an in-depth sounding of U.S. public opinion. He not only held talks with the U.S. President and other administration leaders but also found time to meet with members of Congress, prominent members of the public and business circles, figures active in science and the arts, and mass media leaders. Having noted that it is the duty of the intelligentsia to contribute a scientific and moral element to the elaboration of policy, M.S. Gorbachev asked: Do statesmen sometimes lag behind shifts in the awareness of the people's masses? Are they able to promptly detect these sentiments and transform them into practical actions?

Indeed, the Washington summit disclosed substantial changes in public opinion. And in turn itself became a catalyst of important new changes in people's awareness. The voice of the man in the street has exploded into the forbidden labyrinths of foreign policy with unprecedented force. The public response generated by the Soviet-U.S. summit in Washington showed that diplomacy is ceasing to be the province of professionals alone. The peoples have become aware of the inevitability of disaster and the need for change. They are seeking ways to move closer together and reaching out to each other. People want to live in a world where enormous resources do not have to be spent on weapons which in the final analysis they can only use against themselves. People want to live in a world where all peoples have the right to be the master of their own destiny and choose their own path. They want to know the truth about each other and feel the great panhuman kinship of nations, languages, and cultures

Simultaneously with the end of the 20th century, civilization has come to a dividing line not so much between systems and ideologies as between the ability or inability to look the facts in the face. On one side of this line stands common sense, urging action for the sake of the survival of mankind, and on the other—the fears and prejudices inherited from the "cold war," which lead to confrontation.

Americans are practical people geared to the end result, as it is now fashionable to say in our country. Their natural pragmatism cannot fail to tell them that it is more beneficial, simpler, more reliable, and cheaper to promote trust ("trust and verify," in the U.S. President's favorite expression) than to fuel suspicion and enmity; that disputes about the past and present must not rob us of a future.

This brings us back to the idea of a watershed between the era of the growth of the nuclear threat and the era of the demilitarization of the life of mankind. The treaty

signed in Washington makes it possible to cross this line. So there is reason to believe that the ice has shifted, that, despite possible unpredictable changes in the weather, the "winter of our anxiety" has receded into oblivion.

### Rostov on Talks, Opposition

*LD132142 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 13 Dec 87*

[Yuriy Rostov commentary; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] There is obvious unanimity both in the East and in the West now. This does not happen often and perhaps this is a very weighty proof showing that the Soviet-U.S. meeting has been successful. Yet one should not paint too simplified a picture. There are critics and there are also those who could be called a covert opposition to the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit. First, this is a relatively small number of personalities who are still opposing any accords with our country. Then there are those in the West—and their number is, regrettably, greater—who are calling for the upgrading of arms and for building up the arsenals that are beyond the scope of the agreement signed in Washington. There is also criticism of a fundamentally different kind. Certain people are disappointed with the fact that a 50% reduction of strategic offensive weapons was not announced at the meeting. Such critics are obviously underrating the complexity of the problem as it relates to some 90% of the U.S. and Soviet nuclear arsenals.

The last question which is sometimes asked in our country: Why are we destroying more missiles than the United States? Well, this is true, indeed, but this step is not the detriment of our security. I think that it will serve as no bad example for the West, and example of the new approach and thinking which is now, before our eyes, changing the situation in the world.

### Moscow TV Rounds Up Reactions

*LD130016 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 12 Dec 87*

["Studio 20" telebridge linking Moscow with Washington, Tokyo, Budapest, Bonn, and Rome, introduced by Commentator A. Serikov; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] [Serikov] Good evening, comrades. This week we have been witnesses, indeed eyewitnesses, thanks to direct television relays from Washington, to the major political event of the year—the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. Undoubtedly, a great deal will be said and written about its results, for the first step along the road of removing the nuclear threat has just been taken. Still, we can already try to establish the thoughts and feelings aroused by that meeting among different people around the world. To do this, we have invited our correspondents in the United States, Japan, Hungary, W. Germany and Italy to link up with "Studio 20". We spoke with them earlier about this, and all the video features they are going to show were put together at our request.

The foreign news agencies have highly rated the meeting. Here's what the Spanish agency EFE writes, for instance: In 3 days Gorbachev succeeded in winning the sympathies of the majority of Americans; he has made an indelible impression among business and political circles; and he has introduced restructuring and glasnost to the world in an extremely convincing manner. What do the Americans themselves think about this? What are their feelings?

[Correspondent V. Dunayev, outside the White House] Yes, you know, Washington is very cautious with emotion. It is, after all, an administrative city, and the people who live here are fairly serious and discreet. I had no idea that this city and its inhabitants were capable of the kind of outbursts of feeling demonstrated during the visit. It's like a different city altogether, to see the smiles and greetings from people standing along the route taken by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's motorcade, to see just how energetically they welcomed the Soviet leader. It's hard to believe that it's really Washington. Its as if it were another city and different inhabitants. The main reason for this is that the Americans have made a discovery: They have discovered that the Soviet leader, the top communist, the leader of the Soviet state—which has always been portrayed as the potential adversary of the United States—is an exceptionally charming man, with an original way of thinking and an original way of behaving—a very attractive man. He impresses the Americans by his straightforward humor. It is through this discovery, through a personality which radiates charm and vigor, that the Americans have arrived at the essentials of our policy. This is a typical way of doing things here in the United States.

[Serikov] Have the Americans changed their attitude toward us since the visit?

[Dunayev] Has the attitude toward our country changed since the meeting? Yes, it certainly has. Just look at the press and television—there was, of course, nothing like it before. The only question is for how long this will continue, because there are forces in the United States who would like, of course, to return to what existed before, to confrontation, and they are going to seek pretexts. If there aren't any pretexts then they will invent some. But I think that this will now be immeasurably more difficult than before the Washington summit meeting, because you can wipe a videotape, of course, but you can't erase from people's memories their extremely vivid impressions of the visit, the meetings, the discussions, the contacts, the signing of the treaty—all that will remain, and the Americans have, naturally, begun to take a different view of our country. [passage omitted]

[Serikov] We know that, on the whole, official Bonn has given a fairly positive assessment of the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit, but there are probably some nuances. How would you describe the state of mind—if one can put it this way—of the West Germans, now that the summit is over? I put this question to Vladimir Kondratyev.

[Correspondent V. Kondratyev, in Bonn] The dominant tone of the responses to the Washington meeting here is as follows: An exceptionally important event has occurred, one which just a year ago was simply unthinkable. Only the most hardboiled skeptics and representatives of the extreme right wing are taking the liberty of criticizing the treaty. For Strauss, for example, it means a reduction in the FRG's security, since during the Geneva talks the Soviet Union was allegedly busily increasing its quantity of short-range missiles, which are not covered by the signed document. As we know, the slogan used by the FRG's right-wingers is that the shorter the missiles, the more German becomes the effect of their action—or, the shorter the missiles, the deader the Germans.

[Serikov] But how do the right-wingers in the FRG propose resolving this problem?

[Kondratyev] They are demanding that the Soviet Union reduce these missiles on a unilateral basis. They would also like the Soviet Union, again unilaterally, to reduce its conventional arms. If our country doesn't agree to these conditions, then rearmament and modernization should follow. I think that once the wave of excitement caused by the success of the Washington meeting has died away a little we can expect bitter debates precisely on these problems. [passage omitted]

[Serikov] Different people, different feelings and words. But underlying them all is a common desire—to remove the threat of war and create a stable peace. The Soviet-U.S. meeting was a real step toward ensuring that there will never be wars on earth again.

**Further on Reaction to Summit**
*LD131315 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 12 Dec 87*

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Soviet people, foreign statesmen and politicians, and the international public talk about the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting:

[Correspondent P. Orlov—identified by caption] Just a few days ago the world witnessed the first real result of the new thinking in politics—the treaty signed by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and President Reagan on the elimination of two classes of nuclear missiles. Now that the Washington meeting is over it is time for analysis and thoughts about how events will develop further.

[Passerby B. Nagapetyan—identified by caption; interviewed in the street] If this treaty which has just been concluded between the USSR and the United States really does enter into force I think it will be a step toward genuine disarmament. I think it is still to early to talk about actual disarmament. Once a certain number of missiles have been removed then we shall genuinely be living in the age of disarmament.

[Passerby V. Fokin—identified by caption] Well I didn't really expect such a big shift in relations between our countries.

[Orlov] But there has been a real shift, the kind that even...

[Fokin—interrupting] A huge step has been taken as regards a better understanding between our peoples, with each other and contact between Mikhail Sergeyevich and President Reagan. These contacts are simply essential for us to understand each other better, and then perhaps in the future to arrive at a broader solution of these issues which now confront us.

[Orlov] What about allowing access by inspectors from the United States to our military factories, to one of our military factories—in Votkinsk, for instance? How does this fit in with the matter of our security?

[Fokin] Well, you know, if it's necessary, and if there's no other solution, then I think that we should take that step as well. After all, it's a correct step, and there will be more trust in us.

[Scene changes to interview in Kiev—captioned; with B.I. Medovar, academician of the USSR Academy of sciences—identified by caption] Well you see, we are all grown-up people. At the end of the day we are destroying only 3%, around 3 to 4%. This is the first step. Is it the Americans who say step by step? Let's destroy 3% first, then 50% of the strategic missiles, and so on. Nobody in the history of mankind has ever disarmed; everyone has always armed themselves. Let's be frank about it: Our feelings are, all the same, far from euphoric. It's a good thing, and we are happy, we are rejoicing. I would say that the entire people is rejoicing. But let's agree on this, let's juxtapose all that has been accumulated—a huge quantity of deadly weapons—and as I've already said, 3% of them are being destroyed. I would like to see a treaty concluded quickly on destroying half of all of these deadly missiles. I think that it will work, but it's important that it should work with the change of administration as well. It's frequently happened that there's been one thing with one President, and another with the next, and this is a little worrying. Can their side maintain the head of steam, the reciprocal head of steam that, on the whole, has appeared today? Nobody can tell; only history will show.

[Scene changes to show B.V. Raushenbakh, academician of the USSR Academy of Sciences—identified by caption—picking up a book entitled 'Breakthrough']

[Commentator T. Komarova—identified by caption] Boris Viktorovich Raushenbakh has spent his whole life working on problems relating to controlling space technology. Recently he wrote an article which has been published in a collection brought out simultaneously in our country and in the United States. The book—I have asked Boris Viktorovich to fish out his copy—is called Breakthrough [Proryv], and his article is about the possible consequences for our planet of a nuclear conflict.

It only takes one computer failure for man to cease being the main actor on earth and for machines to begin their rule. Would this be a correct formulation of the main idea in your article?

[Raushenbakh] Even if the computers work perfectly, without a single element breaking down, we still have a system made up of two computer systems in collision. It will be unstable, and for that reason [words indistinct], and in human terms war will break out. There is no need at all for computer failures for a computer war to break out. This is the most dreadful thing. Nor are any other special circumstances needed either—they can begin the war themselves. Moreover, the reasons (?for the computer war) will never be known, since neither side knows what the other is doing.

It's interesting that this book has come out at the very time when the treaty is being signed, the treaty we're all talking about on the elimination of two classes of missiles. You know, this is a very interesting moment in the purely historical sense: There has never been anything like it, even during the time of the League of Nations.

As for what difficulties I foresee, difficulties that we haven't yet taken into account, let's say that there will be a 50% reduction in strategic missiles, which is what they are talking about at the moment. But further reductions are unthinkable unless Britain, France, and China join in the process, because, after all, they too possess nuclear weapons. As long as the level of atomic and nuclear weapons possessed by the USSR and the United States is significantly higher than their's we can reach agreements without them. But [words indistinct] they will have to be included and there will be discussion not between two countries, but between five. It's in this sense, I think, (?despite) the tremendous difficulties—political ones, economic ones, and whatever—nonetheless we have succeeded in signing an agreement. This gives us grounds for hoping that further, and perhaps more difficult steps, will be easier to take than we think, because the ice has broken, as they say.

## United States & Canada

### U.S., USSR Sign Space Cooperation Protocol

*LD111958 Moscow TASS in English 1656 GMT 11 Dec 87*

[Text] Moscow December 11 TASS—The first working protocol in furtherance of an agreement on Soviet-U.S. cooperation in space exploration was signed here today by Samuel Keller, deputy director of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), and Valeriy Barsukov, director of the Geochemistry and and Analytical Chemistry Institute of the Soviet Academy of Sciences. This act capped the week-long discussion in one of the three working groups set up under the agreement—the Solar System Research Group.

"One may hope that man will be able to fly to Mars early next century. I am convinced that this will be an international crew", said Valeriy Barsukov, a corresponding member of the Soviet Academy of Sciences. "It will bring a sample of Mars soil to Earth. We agreed to study the possible spots on Mars in which to land spacecraft".

Samuel Keller noted that the two countries' specialists reached a unanimous view that the flight to Mars was inevitable but what was still more inevitable was the need for close cooperation between the two leading space powers in expeditions to outer planets.

At the meeting the space experts exchanged information obtained from interplanetary stations of the USSR and the United States. American specialists, for instance, have already made their contribution to the work on the international project "Phobos". They transferred to Soviet scientists data on the characteristics of the space surrounding Mars. In their turn, American colleagues praised the reply step by Soviet scientists who handed over to NASA an album of 27 maps of Venus' surface.

Barsukov told newsmen the way preparations were going on for the international project "Phobos" involving scientists from several countries and also specialists from the European Space Agency.

The first Soviet interplanetary craft will be launched in July 1988. In several days, it will be followed by the second craft. Tests of the onboard equipment are proceeding apace. The work will be finalized in January-February. Landing crafts are under preparations in parallel. They will be dropped on Phobos—one of Mars' moons.

The exploration of the solar system planets requires vast technical resources and efforts by scientists. This work can be accomplished only in close cooperation, Samuel Keller said. He concurred with Valeriy Barsukov that the first crew to make a voyage to Mars will be international.

### Reagan Signs Budget for U.S. 'Secret Services'

*LD041019 Moscow TASS in English 1735 GMT 3 Dec 87*

[Text] Washington December 3 TASS—By TASS correspondent Oleg Polyakovskiy:

President Reagan signed into law on Wednesday the bill on the expenditure of the U.S. secret services in the current fiscal year, which began on October 1.

In signing the bill, which was approved by both chambers of the Congress, the President expressed regret over the 2.5-3.5 percent cut in his request for funds for intelligence activities in connection with the attempts of the law-makers at reducing the federal budget deficit. How much the White House really demanded and how much money has the Congress appropriated are kept secret. Yet accordingto the CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY weekly, the annual appropriations to the CIA, the National Security Agency, the Defense Intelligence Agency and other similar departments are more than 10 billion dollars a year.

The tasks set ot the secret services are truly diverse—from espionage and misinformation to sabotage, from plots to overthrow governments objectionable to Washington to fanning regional conflicts. It must be noted, for that matter, that the volume of the appropriations on these operations is, naturally, classified.

Among the published provisions of the bill signed by President Reagan, some also puruse specific anti-Soviet aims. One of them instructs the U.S. defense secretary to prepare a report to Congress on how the new complex of buildings of the USSR Embassy in Washington can be used for electronic intelligence. Under the pretext that it opens the broadest opportunities for such intelligence, many people in U.S. Congress wish to foil the removal of the Soviet Embassy to a new complex. Demands are also voiced either for pulling down the buildings or turning them over to the Government of the United States.

### Moscow TV Carries Documentary on Peace Group

LD040939 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1900 GMT on 3 December carries a 60-minute documentary titled "Let's Go Together", introduced by IZVESTIYA Political Observer Melor Sturua. The documentary is about a peace march by 250 U.S. citizens and 250 Soviet citizens from Leningrad to Moscow on an unidentified date, and includes interviews with march participants and their conversations with people along the route.

In the introduction to the documentary Sturua says: "What you are going to see is a documentary from the point of view of cinema and its genres. Yet I see it as some sort of international agreement, and not only because two contracting parties took part in making it, so to speak, those working in Soviet and U.S. television.

When editing the film each side had the right to veto each frame before it could be included in the film. International agreements are being made the same way." Sturua goes on to say: "Incidentally, trust is the name adopted by a small group of Soviet people who met those taking part in the march. You will see them in the film. I am not going to to carry polemics with them here, because the spirit of the film itself does it splendidly. I would like to say here only the following: Those people made a name for themselves by pushing from the opposite side, yet in their own way and maybe even contrary to their intention they have served a good cause too. The U.S. participants in the march acquired more trust to the policies of glasnost and democratization that are now being conducted by our country."

In Moscow, some of the marchers are shown having a meeting with unidentified members of the Soviet Group of Trust. The meeting was arranged, according to documentary narrator, on the "suggestion of some of the U.S. participants to meet some people who had promised to tell them something that no one else here would." The members of the Group of Trust are shown seated on the stage of a lecture hall with the peace marchers seated in the auditorium.

A member of the Group of Trust says: "The chief aim of the group is the development of trust between peoples, between people, between ordinary people. It sees its aim primarily as searching for the paths on which that trust can be built, and the first path that it found was to do everything it could to ensure that there are contacts between ordinary people. For 5 years the group has been in contact with ordinary people in the West. The group has several times put forward various proposals and initiatives for measures to establish trust, and this year it drew up a package of measures of trust which it offered to the governments of the United States and the Soviet Union. Unfortunately, no reply was received from either the U.S. Government or the Soviet Government, although that package of measures of trust was sent."

The following exchange then takes place between U.S. peace marchers, speaking in English with superimposed Russian translation, and various members of the group:

[U.S. peace marcher] "What do you see as the difference between the foreign policy of the USSR and the United States?"

[Member of Group of Trust] "Whatever policy the United States has, it is controlled by the people. The policy of the Soviet Union, however, is so far, unfortunately, not controlled by the people at all. What I dislike very much is that the declared peace aims are not in accordance with what is actually practiced, and this has been manifested on several occasions: the occupation of Czechoslovakia, a similar occupation of Hungary in 1956, and interference in other countries' affairs, sometimes acting itself and sometimes with the help of satellite regimes—Angola, Nicaragua, and things like that. Kampuchea, too. The most important thing today is, of course, the war in Afghanistan."

[U.S. peace marcher] "What is your opinion of the peace march?"

[Member of Group of Trust] "Such a march over a long distance, when its U.S. participants were able to come into contact with ordinary people in the Soviet Union, is very good."

[Member of Group of Trust] "We hope that next year on the peace march in the United States there will be ordinary Soviet people, and not ones who have been prepared beforehand!

[Member of Group of Trust] "But unfortunately the members of the group of trust were unable to take part in this march."

[U.S. peace marcher] "How many members do you have?"

[Member of Group of Trust] "We have no precise number. We have a notional number of members. The people who work actively are the activists, and there are 20 to 30 of them.

[U.S. peace marcher] "What ways do you see of solving the problems you have named?"

[Member of Group of Trust] "In order to establish trust and contacts between people, the Soviet Union should change its policy with regard to the right to leave the country."

At this point an unidentified Soviet man is shown standing in the auditorium addressing the two groups. He says: "This is the first time I have met the members of the Group of Trust, and I get the impression that their activity is counterproductive: It doesn't correspond to the policy of establishing trust between the peoples and governments of our countries. What that lady was saying in essence directly reflects the opinion of the Reagan administration. If the group adheres to that position, then what support can there be from the U.S. people or the Soviet people? So the question is: Do you sincerely believe that you really are promoting the cause of peace in some way, or are you engaged in self-glorification?"

A member of the Group of Trust replies: "For that you'll have to ask the Soviet and U.S. peoples." Another says: "Yes, we sincerely believe that the activity of our group is promoting the establishment of trust between the peoples of the United States and the people of the Soviet Union, and between East and West."

## Briefs

### 150 Million View Telebridge

In the television viewers companion competition for October, the largest number of viewers was drawn by the second telebridge between the USSR Supreme Soviet and the U.S. Congress, devoted to human rights. It was watched by more than 150 million viewers in our country alone. In the section for topicality and novelty of subject matter, the documentary film "Risk" was the undoubted leader of the month. [Summary] [*Moscow Television Service in Russian 1900 GMT 30 Nov 87 LD*]

## China

### Huang Hua Hails Signing of INF Treaty

*LD122016 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1515 GMT 12 Dec 87*

[Text] Beijing, 12 Dec (TASS)—China welcomes the signing of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles and considers this as only a first step, a good start on the path of disarmament, Huang Hua, vice chairman of the standing Committee of the Chinese National People's Congress [NPC], has stated. Today he received here a delegation of the Committee of Youth organizations of the USSR led by Chairman S.N. Chelnokov, which is in the PRC on a visit at the invitation of the All-China Youth Federation.

Huang Hua noted that it is necessary to make further efforts for a large-scale reduction in strategic offensive and conventional weapons. China, together with all peace-loving countries, is prepared to struggle for a lessening of international tension, the Chinese leader said.

During the meeting the deputy head of the NPC acquainted the Soviet youth delegation with the decisions of the 13th CPC Congress which ended recently, and the progress of the reforms being implemented in the country, and talked about the role of China's young generation in the cause of socialist construction.

### PRC Protests to U.S. on Tibet Amendment

*LD112027 Moscow TASS in English 1747 GMT 11 Dec 87*

[Text] Beijing December 11 TASS—Chinese Deputy Foreign Minister Zhu Qizhen has protested to the U.S. ambassador to the People's Republic of China over the adoption by the U.S. Congress of an amendment to the resolution on the violation by China of human rights in Tibet.

The Chinese official said that the notorious amendment distorted the true state of affairs in Tibet, contained open slander of the government and the people of China. The decision by the U.S. Congress also constituted gross interference in the internal affairs of China. Tibet is an inalienable part of the People's Republic of China and all issues related to it were in exclusive competence of the Chinese Government, Zhu Qizhen said.

The protest statement also emphasizes that both the Chinese and American sides agree that relations between the two countries should be based on the principles of mutual non-interference in each other's internal affairs, respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity. The Chinese-U.S. relations can receive a successful boost only on condition that these principles are adhered to. Therefore, the Chinese side persistently demands that the United States take measures to put a stop to interference in the internal affairs of the People's Republic of China and prevent such incidents in the future.

### RENMIN RIBAO Denounces U.S. 'Interference' on Tibet

*LD122249 Moscow TASS in English 1445 GMT 12 Dec 87*

[Text] Beijing December 12 TASS—Today the newspaper "RENMIN RIBAO", an organ of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, called an amendment to the resolution on violation of human rights in Tibet by China, passed by U.S. Congress, an act of interference in China's home affairs and slander against the government and the people of China.

The Chinese people have never elected U.S. Congressmen and, naturally, have never granted them any right to busy themselves with questions pertaining strictly to China's domestic affairs, the newspaper points out. Therefore, what was done by U.S. Congressmen is not a legal act but a downright interference.

Regrettable is also the fact, "RENMIN RIBAO" notes, that "Guardians of human rights" did not utter a word in the past. Now that the Tibetan people won the rights of masters of their country and are building a new life, Washington started demanding that human rights in Tibet be protected. It is self-evident that such actions are spearheaded at undermining Chinese-American relations, the newspaper writes in conclusion.

### Increasing Trade Volume With Heilongjiang

*OW121351 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0600 GMT 11 Dec 87*

[Text] The volume of export goods from China's Heilongjiang Province is unprecedentedly high this year. According to a report by a radio broadcasting station in Heilongjiang, this province in China has earned more than US $700 million by selling its goods abroad. It has also added soybean and other traditional goods on its export list.

Heilongjiang maintains trade and economic relations with many countries, including the Soviet Union. It is one of the Chinese provinces that resumed trading with the Soviet border areas in 1983. The trade between the

two sides is rapidly expanding. According to initial statistics, Heilongjiang's trade with the Far East and Siberia regions of the Soviet Union this year has been increased by 80%.

## Northeast Asia

### Japanese Leaders Hail Missile Treaty, Summit

*PM111637 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Dec 87 Morning Edition p 4*

[Own correspondent S. Agafonov report: "Key to Solving the Problem"]

[Text] Tokyo—The time difference between Washington and Tokyo is 14 hours, but the main television companies are extending their programs to bring live transmissions from the American capital. The Soviet-U.S. summit meeting and the signing of the historic treaty that will eliminate an entire class of nuclear weapons have been front-page news for newspapers and magazines, and are viewed as a most important event in world politics. The achievement of an accord between the USSR and the United States on the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles has met with a lively response and been highly appraised, not only in the Japanese mass media but also among political and business circles, as well as the approval and support of the Japanese public.

Japanese Prime Minister Noboru Takeshita has welcomed the signing of the Soviet-U.S. treaty and voiced the hope that it will be the first step in the elaboration of new accords, will initiate a further reduction in nuclear weapons, and have a positive effect with regard to improving Soviet-Japanese relations. Japanese Foreign Minister Uno underlined the importance of the earliest possible ratification of the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles in his statement, describing the treaty as the first step toward nuclear disarmament.

IZVESTIYA's own correspondent in Tokyo was received by Masaaki Fujita, speaker of the upper chamber of the Japanese parliament. In the ensuing conversation he said:

"I was born in the Hiroshima prefecture, which is also my electoral district. During the tragic nuclear bombing operation in 1945 I lost many relatives, and this fact in itself determines my attitude toward nuclear weapons. We are in favor of their total elimination—this is our deepest hope—and consequently we welcome the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Medium-and Shorter-Range Missiles. This treaty provides for the elimination of just 4% of all nuclear warheads, but I would like to think that this is only the first step toward the attainment of a final goal. New talks on other types of nuclear weapons are impending, including talks on strategic offensive weapons, and I hope that a solution will also gradually be found in this area.

"If we look at life realistically we probably have to admit that it will be very difficult to get rid of nuclear weapons entirely. Although we all hope for a global-zero option, we still doubt whether this hope is feasible. After all, in today's world the USSR and the United States are not the only states with nuclear arsenals. In short, the issue is extremely complicated, although I agree that building mutual trust and expanding dialogue can bring the world closer to its desired aim. Strictly speaking, confidence is the key to solving the problem. It must be remembered that the treaty signed in Washington was preceded by long years of negotiations on nuclear disarmament and efforts by several U.S. governments and several of your country's leaders. The result is this initial step which allows us to suppose that future talks and discussions on nuclear issues will no longer follow a zigzag path, and that although medium-and shorter-range missiles account for only 4% of nuclear arsenals, the accord on them will create the basis for further progress. This will possibly take a long time, but we now have positive experience on which to build.

"I must also mention the general positive influence exerted by this Soviet-U.S. summit. Soviet-U.S. relations are the cornerstone of the state of East-West affairs. Any extra warmth in these relations will have a positive impact on the world situation as a whole and on our bilateral relations, which still include the question of the four islands and a number of other unresolved problems. I think the climate of trust will help to improve our relations," Masaaki Fujita, speaker of the upper chamber of the Japanese parliament, said in conclusion.

### No Revision of Defense Policy

*LD111502 Moscow TASS in English 1436 GMT 11 Dec 87*

[Text] Tokyo December 11 TASS—Japanese Prime Minister Noboru Takeshita hailed today the results of the Soviet-American summit meeting. Addressing a meeting of the budgetary commission of the upper chamber of the Japanese parliament, he spoke highly of the actions of the two great powers which signed the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles.

In answer to the inquiries by the parliament deputies, the Japanese premier said that the signing of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles would not lead to an immediate revision of Japan's defence policy.

### USSR, Japan Fail To Agree in Fishery Talks

*OW120211 Tokyo KYODO in English 0152 GMT 12 Dec 87*

[Text] Moscow, Dec. 11 KYODO—Japan and the Soviet Union on Friday failed to agree on Japanese fishing activities for 1988 in an exclusive 200-mile economic zone off Soviet territory and decided to postpone the deadline for their negotiations until next Wednesday, Japanese officials here said.

The Japanese delegation said there is a strong possibility that negotiations will not produce an agreement before the newly-set deadline as both sides remain far apart in their positions.

The Soviet side asked Japan to pay 2.35 billion yen as a fishery cooperation fee, while Japan proposed a figure of 1.16 billion yen.

The Soviets also insisted that an inspection office be establish monitor Japanese observance of a bilateral fishery agreement. The Japanese delegation, however, rejected the proposal, the officials said.

During the negotiations, both sides agreed on a 1988 catch quota which allows Japan to catch 200,000 tons of fish without cost and 100,000 tons at counter value, they said.

### Japan To Increase Military Base Expenditure

*LD140949 Moscow TASS in English 0828 GMT 14 Dec 87*

[Text] Tokyo December 14 TASS—The Government of Japan intends to increase by 4,000 million yen its share of expenditures for the maintenance of U.S. military bases on the country's territory.

The MAINICHI DAILY news reports that, according to government plans, in the 1988 financial year Japan will bear a half of the cost of the remuneration of labour of the Japanese personnel employed at U.S. military facilities.

The aggregate number of the Japanese personnel working at U.S. military facilities is now 21,000.

Prime Minister Noboru Takeshita of Japan will inform the U.S. side of this decision during an official visit to Washington, which he intends to pay in January next year.

The newspaper points out that the increase in appropriations for the maintenance of the U.S. military bases is being undertaken by the Takeshita government as a measure of indirect support for the U.S. armed forces' actions in the Persian Gulf.

The taking of such a measure was promised to Washington two months ago by the previous cabinet of Yasuhiro Nakasone.

### ROK Concerned About Military Role in Elections

*LD131548 Moscow TASS in English 1856 GMT 12 Dec 87*

[Ttext] Tokyo December 12 TASS—TASS correspondent Vladimir Solntsev reports:

Nearly ten thousand policemen encircled Seoul's Yoido Plaza where presidential candidate from the ruling South Korean regime, retired general No Tae-u addressed his supporters today. His speech was timed for the eighth anniversary of the military coup which brought to power the present South Korean dictator Chon Tu-hwan. No Tae-u who then commanded a division played the key role in those events, and later in suppressing an uprising of the people in May 1980 in the city of Kwangju. There is information that over two thousand unarmed people were massacred there.

The retired general who covets the presidency promised, specifically, that if he is elected president at the December 16 general elections he would ensure the neutrality of the military in political affairs. But the opposition is seriously concerned that South Korea's military might step in to determine once again as to who becomes the head of state. Just as the police corps somewhat earlier, the 600-thousand South Korean army has been put on high alert as of today. One of the main presidential candidates, leader of the party of Peace and Democracy Kim Tae-yong said that on the authorities' order, senior officers in the Army order their subordinates to cast their ballots for the candidate of the ruling regime. Under the existing rules, the military should vote earlier. At a press conference on Friday Kim Tae-yong said that 20-year old soldier Chong Yong-kwan who dared defy the order and vote for a representative of the opposition forces died early in December from the beating by officers. The Seoul authorities were compelled today to admit the serviceman's death, but they hastened to state that the incident is unrelated to the elections.

No Tae-u's promise to carry out a broad amnesty of political prisoners sounds unconvincing in the extreme. The organization of human rights fighters has the information that the total number of prisoners in South Korean jails reaches one thousand. Last Thursday alone, some 50 people were arrested in the city of Chongju where the local people disrupted election meetings of the ruling party's candidate. The government yesterday issued an order for the arrest of all "subversive elements hindering the holding of the elections."

### DPRK Concludes Demobilization of Troops

*LD140940 Moscow TASS in English 0653 GMT 14 Dec 87*

[Text] Pyongyang December 14 TASS—The demobilization of 100,000 men from the Korean People's Army has been completed. This step was prompted by the striving of the DPRK Government to promote disarmament and detente, to eliminate the danger of war on the Korean Peninsula and to create favourable conditions for ensuring peace and the country's peaceful reunification, the high command of the Korean People's Army said in a statement released by the Korean Central News Agency here today.

The DPRK Government, the statement runs, put forward a proposal on July 23, 1987, on a large and phased reduction of armed forces and simultaneously announced its decision to reduce unilaterally the army strength by 100,000 men by the end of 1987. As a result, large financial resources and manpower were released into peaceful construction and raising the well-being of the people. Tens of thousands of demobilized soldiers are currently working at industrial enterprises, in agriculture and other branches of the economy.

## Southeast Asia & Pacific

### ASEAN Meeting Opens in Manila

*LD140930 Moscow TASS in English 0808 GMT 14 Dec 87*

[Text] Manila December 14 TASS—TASS Special correspondents Sergey Almazov, Aleksandr Kiselyov and Georgiy Shmelev report:

A meeting of the heads of state and government of the member-countries of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) opened here today.

Issues concerning the widening of trade and economic cooperation, and matters aimed at strengthening regional security, stability and progress are the principal items on the agenda of the Manila forum. President Corazon Aquino of the Philippines was elected to preside over the summit.

In their speeches at the opening of the meeting the heads of state and government gave a positive appraisal of the Soviet-U.S. treaty on the elimination of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles.

President Suharto of Indonesia emphasized that the treaty would have a stabilizing effect on the situation in South-East Asia and on the solution of conflict situations in various regions, and regional problems. The Indonesian president pointed out that the Soviet-U.S. treaty inspired hope for ridding mankind of the threat of being annihilated in a nuclear conflagration.

Philippine President Corazon Aquino stated that the Philippines, just as the other ASEAN member-countries, were aware of their deep responsibility for the maintenance of peace and stability in South-East Asia.

"We attach special importance to the forthcoming discussion of these issues at the meeting, including initiatives concerning the establishment of a zone of peace, freedom, and neutrality (Zopfan) in South-East Asia, and the proposal on the proclamation of the region a nuclear free zone," Corazon Aquino emphasized.

ASEAN plays an important role in the maintenance of peace and stability in the region, stated Prime Minister Mahathir bin Mohamed of Malaysia. He pointed out ASEAN's commitment to the principles of regional cooperation in solving the problems of economic development and cultural progress, and joint resistance to the growing protectionism of the industrially developed states.

### Gorbachev Sends Greetings

*LD141208 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0000 GMT 14 Dec 87*

[Text] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev sent a message to Philippine President Corazon Aquino, chairman of the third ASEAN summit. The greetings message says: "Esteemed Madam Chairman! In connection with the third meeting of the heads of states and governments of the ASEAN member countries, allow me to greet you and all its participants. The present meeting of the leaders of ASEAN member countries is being held at a crucial time, when hopeful signs have appeared in the world for improvement in the international situation, and real possibilities have opened for mankind to make a start by the elimination of nuclear weapons and the removal of the threat of a nuclear disaster.

The signing of the Soviet-U.S. agreement on the liquidation of medium- and shorter-range missiles is the first major step toward real disarmament. It opens a way toward new, important accords on strengthening peace and security. However, the hearts and minds of millions of people on earth are still intensely alarmed by the continuing arms race, the tension in many regions of the world, and the exacerbation of the financial and economic difficulties of developing countries which are compounding their struggle for strengthening political and economic independence.

In our view, further persistent efforts are required to ensure that the positive changes in the current world situation that have taken shape become a stable tendency leading to a just world, free of nuclear arms and violence.

Madam Chairman! The Soviet Union follows ASEAN activity with interest and sympathy and does justice to the positive results attained by its member countries in the course of national construction and the establishment of cooperation within the association's framework. Having proclaimed 20 years ago a course toward economic, social, and cultural progress, the association member countries have noticeably advanced in implementing their set goals while overcoming considerable difficulties. We appreciate the ASEAN member states' efforts to preserve peace, ease international tension, and achieve disarmament. We note the attention with which the Soviet proposals on the problems of the Asia-Pacific region as set out in Vladivostok and in the interview with the newspaper MERDEKA have been received in the ASEAN member countries. We are grateful for support lent to Soviet peace initiatives, both in the UN and at other international forums, where our countries have been cooperating quite fruitfully.

For our part, Comrade Gorbachev's message says, we see a considerable positive potential in such constructive proposals as the concept of turning Southeast Asia in a zone of peace, freedom, and neutrality—ZOPFAN. The Soviet side has more than once expressed its positive attitude toward the aspiration of ASEAN countries and of the region's other states to set up a nuclear-free zone in Southeast Asia. The practical solution of these issues could contribute significantly to normalizing the situation in this part of Asia.

An unblocking of the conflict situation around Cambodia via political means would undoubtedly promote to a great extent the consolidation of a firm and stable peace in Southeast Asia. We are deeply convinced that the situation in this region needs to be improved radically, and are doing everything in our power in the interests of this. We welcome all constructive efforts and initiatives that would lead to the solution of this problem, which is important for the Asia-Pacific region. On its part, the Soviet Union is prepared to continue contributing by promoting the implementation of practical steps aimed at the elimination of regional tension.

It is our firm conviction that the establishment of a broad, equal, and mutually beneficial cooperation between all Asian states would be a reliable guarantee of the elimination of the war threat and of the improvement of the political climate in Asia and the Pacific basin. This is the right path to establishing trust and mutual understanding among the peoples. I would like to emphasize once again that the Soviet Union is open to various, including collective, forms of mutual relations with the ASEAN member countries, and is prepared to maintain relations with that association.

### Australian Foreign Minister Leaves Moscow

*LD111634 Moscow TASS in English 1230 GMT 11 Dec 87*

[Text] Moscow December 11 TASS—Australian Minister for Foreign Affairs William Hayden left Moscow today. He stayed here within the framework of an official visit to the USSR by Prime Minister Robert Hawke of Australia.

### TASS, Australian News Agency Sign Agreement

*PM091549 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Dec 87 Morning Edition p 5*

[TASS report: "Agreement Signed"]

[Text] An agreement on cooperation in the sphere of information was signed in Moscow on 8 December between TASS and the news agency Australian Associated Press (AAP).

The agreement was signed for TASS by deputy general director A. Krasikov and for AAP by editor Peter Brown.

### Moscow Ceremony Marks Lao National Holiday

*PM071327 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Dec 87 Second Edition p 4*

[TASS report: "Lao People's Festival"]

[Text] A ceremonial meeting of representatives of Moscow's working people devoted to the Lao national holiday was held 1 December. The keynote speaker was V.P. Maslin, chairman of the Soviet-Lao Friendship Society Central Board and first deputy chairman of the Soviet Peace Fund. Thongsavat Nyamani [name as published], acting chairman of the Lao-Soviet Friendship Society Central Board and head of the society's delegation, also spoke.

Participating in the meeting were A.E. Voss, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities; I.S. Silayev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; and representatives of party, soviet, and public organizations. Thongsavat Khaikhamphithoun, Lao ambassador to the USSR, was present.

Soviet-Lao Friendship Week opened in our country the same day. Friendship meetings and soirees will be held in Moscow, the Ukraine, Kazakhstan, and Armenia, lectures and movie shows will take place, and exhibitions will open.

### Movie Industry Cooperation With Laos Planned

*PM041153 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Dec 87 Morning Edition p 4*

[TASS report under general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] A plan for cooperation between the USSR State Committee for Cinematography and the Lao People's Democratic Republic Ministry of Culture in 1988 was signed in Moscow 1 December.

The document makes provision for the joint staging of movie premieres and festivals. Soviet cinematography workers will give technical and creative assistance to their colleagues in the friendly country.

### Briefs

#### Cultural Cooperation With Laos

A protocol on cooperation has been signed in Vientiane between the ministries of culture of the USSR and the Lao People's Democratic Republic for 1988. The document envisages the exchange of creative collectives and groups of artists, a study tour by Lao specialists in the USSR, the raising of their qualifications, and work in Laos with local creative forces by Soviet masters of various genres. For the first time, the decision has been made to establish direct contacts between corresponding cultural establishments and to exchange for this purpose plenipotentiary representatives. [Excerpts] [*Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 13 Dec 87 LD*]

## Near East & South Asia

### Israel Pursuing 'Reckless Military Ventures'

*LD111453 Moscow TASS in English 0833 GMT 11 Dec 87*

[Text] Moscow December 11 TASS—Analyst Grigoriy Vasilyev writes:

The U.N. General Assembly denounced Israel's policy and practices on the occupied Arab territories as war crimes and offence to mankind. Its resolutions on Israel's actions affecting human rights point out that terror and killings of defenceless demonstrators, tortures of arrested people, including children, have become an every-day practice on these territories.

The international community wrathfully denounced arbitrary actions by the Israeli aggressors at a time when invaders launched new reprisals against protesters in the Gaza Strip. They fired on peaceful demonstrations. As a result, some people were killed and dozens wounded. The occupiers carried out roundups. To dispurse demonstrations, Tel Aviv uses Army units, helicopters drop tear gas bombs on Palestinians.

Under these conditions the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly assume special importance and topicality. These documents are approved on the eve of the U.N.-sponsored day of human rights which is extensively marked in the world. These rights are blatantly trampled underfoot by the ruling Zionist clique of Israel both inside the country and on the occupied Arab lands. The very fact of occupation of these lands, the resolutions point out, is a serious violation of human rights.

It is indicative that Washington and Tel Aviv, allies in the anti-Arab strategic alliance, were the only ones to stand out against world public opinion, as it was repeatedly the case in the past (when the U.N. General Assembly had adopted resolutions denouncing Israel's aggressive actions and policy).

The policy of reckless military ventures and territorial expansion against Arab neighbours which is being pursued by Israel, is a challenge to the international public at large, defiance of the basic standards of international law and human rights and open violation of the U.N. charter.

### Soviet-Egyptian Friendship Society Holds Meeting

*LD111631 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0055 GMT 11 Dec 87*

[Text] Moscow, 10 Dec (TASS)—TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Kiselev reports:

A just and firm peace in the Near East can and must be based on principles in accord with the general norms of international law and the specific decisions of the UN Security Council and the General Assembly on this problem, stated Ivan Pavlenko, member of the board of the USSR-Egypt Friendship Society. He was speaking here today at the fourth all-union report-back election conference of the society.

There must be strict observation of the inadmissibility of seizure of other people's lands by aggression, he stressed. And that means that all the territories occupied by Israel must be returned to the Arabs. There must be implementation in practice of the inalienable right of the people of Palestine to self-determination and to the creation of their own independent state on Palestinian lands.

In a unanimously adopted decision, the conference delegates expressed their concern at the situation in the Near East, condemned the intrigues of imperialism and Zionism which are directed at dividing the Arabs, eliminating the Palestine resistance movement and annexing the Arab territories seized by Israel.

The document says that the conference unanimously supports the Soviet peace initiatives and the constructive program for a radical improvement of the international situation, the achievement of a nuclear-free world and a just settlement of the situation in the Near East by means of convening an international conference on this question. The participation of the PLO, the only legitimate representative of the Palestinian people in the work of this conference must be ensured. Salah ad-Din Hasan Basyuni, Egyptian ambassador to the USSR, spoke at the conference.

### Libya Protests French Decision on Arms for Chad

*LD122346 Moscow TASS in English 1559 GMT 12 Dec 87*

[Text] Tripoli December 12 TASS—The French ambassador to Tripoli was today summoned to the People's Bureau for External Relations of Libya to hear a protest over the French Government's decision to resume arms supplies to the Chadian Government.

Libya, JANA news agency said, described the French move as aimed at aggravating the situation in the region and posing a threat to peace and security there. Besides, it will complicate efforts by the Organization of African Unity.

### PDRY Court Sentences Former President To Death

*LD130811 Moscow TASS in English 0735 GMT 13 Dec 87*

[Text] Aden December 13 TASS—The Supreme Court of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen (PDRY) has sentenced the country's former president 'Ali Nasir Muhammad to death. He was tried in his absence.

Another 34 death sentences, including 19 in absentia, were passed here at the concluding court session examining the case of the defendants who had sided with 'Ali Nasir Muhammad during the January 13, 1986, events.

A large group of defendants was sentenced to various terms of imprisonment ranging from five to fifteen years. Six people were found not guilty. All the sentences should be confirmed by the republic's president.

Ninety-four defendants were present at the trial in person. A verdict on another 44 defendants was brought in their absence.

All the defendants were charged with high treason, and part of them were charged with being involved in terrorism, sabotage, and other crimes.

Forty-three hundred people had died in the armed clashes in January last year, it was reported at the court session.

### YAR Deputy Premier Meets Soviet Delegation

*LD131640 Moscow TASS in English 1542 GMT 13 Dec 87*

[Text] San'a December 13 TASS—"We highly appreciate the assistance rendered to our revolution by the friendly Soviet people and express heartfelt gratitude to the land of Soviets for its aid in the construction of key projects in our country", Muhammad Sa'id al-'Attar has stated. The deputy prime minister, minister of development and chairman of the Central Planning Organization of the Yemen Arab Republic spoke at the session of the intergovernmental commission for economic and technical cooperation between the Yemen Arab Republic and the USSR that has opened here. A Soviet delegation is taking part in the work of the session.

Al-'Attar expressed satisfaction over the state of bilateral relations "based on friendship, mutual respect, equality and understanding of each other's stand on regional and general international programs".

Touching upon perestroyka now under way in the USSR, al-'Attar said that it was evidence of a deep and solid nature of the course of the Soviet social system towards a further growth of the wellbeing of the people through raising production efficiency.

### Jordanian King Praises Ties With Soviet Union

*LD131621 Moscow TASS in English 1412 GMT 13 Dec 87*

[Text] Beirut December 13 TASS—Jordanian King Husayn spoke highly of the current state of Soviet-Jordanian relations. We have excellent relations with the Soviet Union, he said in an interview with the Lebanese newspaper AL-SAFIR. In the past, we sometimes had disagreements. Yet in recent years both sides deeply feel the sincerity of each other's stands. Therefore I can say that I do not believe that there was in principle a difference between our stands, he said.

Jordanian monarch again declared for the convocation of an international conference on the Middle East. An overwhelming majority of the countries of the world. He said, have accepted that idea since it outlines a practical way towards a just and comprehensive settlement of the problem destabilising the situation not only in the Middle East region, but also all over the world. [sentences as received] Only the extremist circles of Israel and the United States are opposing the convocation of such an international forum, King Husayn noted.

### DRA's Najibullah Interviewed on D.C. Summit

*LD131858 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 13 Dec 87*

[from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Our Kabul correspondent had an interview with President Najibullah of the Republic of Afghanistan.

[Begin recording] [Leshchinskiy] Esteemed president, I think it will not be a mistake to say that in Afghanistan, in a country where a war has been raging for more than 8 years, people were following the Washington summit with particular attention. What is your view of the results of the meeting?

[Najibullah in vernacular with superimposed Russian translation] For those 3 days, people on earth became closer to one another. All mankind followed with unremitting attention the meeting in Washington. Everybody understands that the foundation for a new world order was being laid down in those days, for a world without wars or violence, based on principles that break the logic of the cold war, the arms race, confrontation, and regional tension.

The breakthrough in international policy that clearly emerged in those days in Washington had been ripening for decades. The range of differences in the positions of the two greatest powers was extremely wide; therefore, the first steps toward each other and the search for mutual understanding in Geneva and Reykjavik were dramatic. The threads being tied together were too thin, and the first accords seemed to be too fragile. The great persistence, flexibility and wisdom shown, first of all, by the Soviet leadership, made it possible for the third meeting to take place, its main result being the striving to attain a nuclear-free world and to preserve life and civilization on earth.

The word "Afghanistan" could often be heard at the talks. It has become, to a certain degree, a symbol of various regional conflicts. Mankind's progress toward comprehensive peace may be hampered unless those conflicts are solved. That is why solving the Afghan problem is one of the most important and significant steps towards peace. The taut knot of contradictions here, in the heart of Asia, must be unravelled in the near future. Our people have shown in word and deed their preparedness for peace to be established in our land. The

national reconciliation policy is becoming part of the movement toward peace. The Afghan people see a profound meaning in the fact that the meeting began a month after a great celebration, the 70th anniversary of the October Socialist Revolution. The signing of the Soviet-U.S. agreement shows clearly the Soviet people's adherence to the humanistic principles of the Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence.[end recording]

## Sub-Saharan Africa

### Zimbabwe's Mugabe Congratulates Summit Leaders

*LD092255 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1932 GMT 9 Dec 87*

[Excerpts] Harare, 9 Dec (TASS)—According to the view of the Nonaligned Movement, the signing of the Treaty between the USSR and the United States on the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles will become a gigantic step in the cause of creating safe world, world free of nuclear threat. This is stated in a message which was sent today by Robert Mugabe, chairman of the Nonaligned Movement, prime minister of Zimbabwe, to Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. [passage omitted] An analogous message was sent to U.S. President Ronald Reagan.

### CPSU Greets Angolan Party on 10th Anniversary

*PM110847 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Dec 87 Second Edition p 3*

[Undated CPSU Central Committee greeting to Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola-Labor Party Central Committee on its 10th anniversary]

[Text] To the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola-Labor Party [MPLA-PT] Central Committee

Dear Comrades!

The CPSU Central Committee cordially congratulates you on the 10th anniversary of the MPLA-PT.

The creation of the MPLA-PT was a very important event in the history of Angola and marked a new stage in the Angolan people's struggle for firmer political independence and social progress. Over the years Angola's working people have achieved weighty results under the MPLA-PT's leadership in eliminating the consequences of colonialism and implementing political and socioeconomic transformations.

Friendly Angola is currently going through a complex period. International reactionary circles and the racist RSA are using all possible means—from support for criminal bandit groups and economic blackmail to direct acts of aggression—to turn it from its chosen path. Angola is courageously countering the intrigues of imperialist and racist forces. The staunchness of the Angolan people and their party in defending the revolutionary gains and your country's peace-loving foreign policy course have won deserved respect in the world.

The Soviet Communists and all the Soviet people confirm their firm international solidarity with you, dear comrades.

Relations between the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of Angola are built on the strong foundation of the Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation between our countries. Fraternal ties are developing successfully between the CPSU and the MPLA-PT. Permit us to voice confidence that the time-tested Soviet-Angolan cooperation will continue to strengthen and develop for the good of our peoples, in the interests of peace and international security.

On this portentous day for the MPLA-PT and the people of Angola we wish you, dear comrades, further successes in work and struggle.

The CPSU Central Committee.

### Supreme Soviet Delegation Leaves for Zambia

*PM081545 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Dec 87 Morning Edition p 5*

[TASS report under the general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] A USSR Supreme Soviet delegation headed by G. M. Voskanyan, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, left Moscow to pay an official visit to Zambia on 6 December at the invitation of that country's parliament.

The delegation included Deputies R. V. Kavinskiy, L. D. Ovsyannikov, L.I. Palazhchenko, and Ye. I. Perventsev.

The delegation was seen off at the airport by P. G. Gilashvili, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and other officials.

F. M. Liboma, Zambian ambassador to the USSR, was among the send-off party.

### Meets ANC's Alfred Nzo

*LD111426 Moscow TASS in English 0915 GMT 11 Dec 87*

[Text] Lusaka December 11 TASS—The delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet led by Grant Voskanyan, vice-president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, currently on an official visit in Zambia at the invitation of that country's parliament met here with the leaders of the African National Congress [ANC] of South Africa and the South African Communist Party.

The Soviet-American treaty on the elimination of two classes of missiles is of great significance to humanity, the meeting was told by Alfred Nzo, ANC general secretary. This document is for the peoples of the world a source of confidence that nuclear weapons will have been completely scrapped by the end of the 20th century.

As a result of the destabilisation policy pursued by the Pretoria Regime, an extremely tense situation has emerged in southern Africa, he said. The racists have stepped up their aggressive actions against the independent states and toughened repressions in South Africa itself. Yet the liberation struggle is steadily mounting. The racists themselves ralise that apartheid can no longer ensure a tranquil future for the country. There is a split among their camp. Many white politicians, public and religious figures, businessmen have realised that the ANC is the most important factor in the South African society's life.

It is by means of terror and censorship that Pretoria rulers have shrouded the events in the RSA in a curtain of silence, said Joe Slovo, general secretary of the South African Communist Party. Yet they could not resolve the deep-going political and socio-economic crisis through which the apartheid state is going. They cannot get away with the holding of the so-called "reforms."

The enemy is still strong, but we are confident of victory, he said. We know that we can always hope for all-round assistance of our friend, the Soviet Union. Joe Slovo expressed gratitude to the USSR for its invariable, disinterested aid and support for the embattled peoples of Southern Africa.

### Kaunda Receives Delegation

*LD121340 Moscow TASS in English 1815 GMT 11 Dec 87*

[Text] Lusaka December 11 TASS—Zambia welcomes the signing of the Soviet-American treaty on the elimination of intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles, said President of the Republic Kenneth Kaunda, receiving in Lusaka today a delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet, led by Grant Voskanyan, vice president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet. This event is an immense stide forward for the good of the peoples of the whole world, the president said. The world will no longer be the same after the Washington summit meeting. We take pride in the fact that we live at a time when the great powers have been able to come to agreement in the queston which affects the interests of all states.

Kenneth Kaunda expressed the hope that the treaty signed would be followed by new agreements in the sphere of nuclear disarmament. He wished that the Soviet Union should continue the efforts aimed at attaining full and universal disarmament, establishing world peace.

The USSR and Zambia maintain very warm relations of friendship, the president said. We are allies in the struggle for abolition of the criminal apartheid system in South Africa. The president expressed confidence that the visit of the parliamentary delegation of the USSR to Zambia would promote further consolidation of relations between the parliaments of the two countries, strengthening of friendship between the peoples of the two countries.

### Demichev Receives Outgoing Ghanaian Ambassador

*LD111646 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 11 Dec 87*

[Text] In the Kremlin today Comrade Demichev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet received John Tettegah, ambassador of the Republic of Ghana to the Soviet Union, in connection with his forthcoming departure for home.

During the discussion, which passed in a friendly atmosphere, it was noted that great opportunities exist for the development of relations between the USSR and Ghana in various spheres. Their further widening and deepening corresponds to the interests of the two sides.

In exchanging views on some key issues of international life, Petr Nikolayevich Demichev and John Tettegah stressed that the signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles between the USSR and United States opens for the whole world a realistic chance to solve topical international problem on the basis on the new political thinking.

### Reznikov, CPSU Delegation Depart for Ghana

*PM081154 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Dec 87 Second Edition p 4*

[TASS report: "Delegation's Departure"]

[Text] A CPSU delegation headed by P. I. Reznikov, first secretary of Kamchatka CPSU Obkom, left for Accra 7 December at the invitation of the Provisional National Defense Council of Ghana.

### Hold Talks With PNDC's Tsikata

*LD101828 Moscow TASS in English 1742 GMT 10 Dec 87*

[Text] Accra December 10 TASS—A visiting delegation from the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) has been received here by Kojo Tsikata, a member of the Provisional National Defense Council (PNDC) of Ghana.

The delegation, led by Petr Reznikov, first secretary of the Kamchatka region committee of the CPSU, is in this country at the invitation of the PNDC.

Tsikata welcomed the Soviet-U.S. treaty for eliminating intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles as a historic step to stronger general peace and security. Speaking at the meeting, he said it had been made a reality first of all thanks to the Soviet Government's consistent and firm policy of delivering mankind from the threat of thermonuclear annihilation.

The elimination of a whole class of deadly missiles would favorably impact the entire international climate, Tsikata said, adding that reason should prevail in the nuclear age.

Ghanian people, he continued, hailed the success and hoped for a further breakthrough in bridling the arms race because they believed that efforts to consolidate national independence and do away with colonialism, apartheid and racial oppression and the peace campaign went together.

Tsikata expressed gratitude to the CPSU and the Soviet Union for their invariable support for popular liberation struggles, including those in southern Africa.

He briefed the guests upon problems facing his country and ways of resolving them. Reform in the state sector under way in Ghana, he said, was aimed at increasing efficiency in the sector and the contribution of government-owned factories to the national economy.

## East Europe

### CSSR's Chnoupek Welcomes Treaty Signing

*LD111120 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 10 Dec 87*

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] [Video shows correspondent S. Andreyev interviewing people on the streets of Prague on their view of the INF Treaty signing; video cuts to CSSR Foreign Minister Bohuslav Chnoupek identified by screen caption]

[Begin Chnoupek recording] Czechoslovakia is one of those nine states on the territory of which these missiles are sited. Therefore, this treaty concerns us directly. And you know that these missiles were sited in our country on the basis of a treaty between the Governments of Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union as a response to the deployment of U.S. Pershing-2 missiles. This is why this historic treaty, which represents a landmark in the postwar history of how mankind, the world, has until now only armed itself—and is now starting to learn to disarm—has a specific, special importance for us. Right from the very beginning, we supported the idea of disarmament. We worked, I would say, with a feeling of comradeship with our comrades from the fraternal socialist countries and the Soviet Union. Right from the beginning, our government gave its support, took active measures, approved and signed a whole series of treaties, so to speak, which formed part of that big treaty, especially concerning points related to inspection [inspektsiya] and on-site verification [kontrol] in Czechoslovakia. We feel sure that this treaty will start a chain reaction in the disarmament sphere, and that it will be possible to set about solving such important questions as the elimination and limitation of strategic missiles or other types of weapons. [end recording]

### Bulgaria's Mladenov Comments on INF Treaty

*PM141135 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Dec 87 First Edition p 4*

[PRAVDA and TASS correspondents 10 December reports under general heading "Our Interviews"]

[Text] Petur Mladenov, member of the BCP Central Committee Politburo and Bulgarian Foreign Minister:

Mankind has breathed a sigh of relief, the long-awaited breakthrough in the sphere of nuclear disarmament has become reality.

An important political document—the Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles—has been signed. The first real step in the difficult struggle for a nuclear-free world has been taken. It is possible to hope that this will have a tremendous impact on the whole range of international relations.

Much difficult work was done to achieve this historic agreement. The credit for this, unquestionably, goes both to the USSR and the United States.

The socialist countries have also contributed to the achievement of the agreement. By their concrete initiatives and statements they demonstrate their unswerving commitment to the ideals of a world without wars or weapons.

The credit for this also goes to the entire peace-loving public which ardently approves and backs efforts aimed at the preservation of peace on earth.

The meeting in Washington marks the beginning of an irreversible process. The socialist countries will continue to actively fight for the elimination of all types of mass annihilation weapons.

The Soviet-American summit and the treaty which has been signed constitute a new page in the annals of contemporary history.

## Poland's Urban Interviewed on Referendum

*LD122344 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1100 GMT 12 Dec 87*

[From the "In the Countries of Socialism" program, presented by Valeriy Korzin]

[Text] [Korzin] The second stage of economic reform is under way in Poland now. The basic provisions of the proposed changes have been submitted to a nationwide discussion. The discussion was carried out throughout the country, in newspapers and magazines, and in labor collectives. On the whole, nobody has doubted this necessity. On the one hand there is the question of ways of attaining the set objectives, on the other hand there is the pace of implementation of the reforms.

A nationwide referendum was carried out in Poland on 29 November. On the eve of this event, certain circles in the West and antisocialist forces in the country attempted to organize a provocative hullabaloo. For instance, former Solidarity leaders even circulated some kind of statement in which they called for a boycott of the referendum. All kinds of inflammatory radio voices were advising the Poles on referendum day not to leave their homes, and then contrarily recommended that they organize protest demonstrations in the streets. And now, after the referendum has taken place, Western propaganda continues to misinterpret its outcome and on the whole falsely describes the atmosphere in which it was carried out.

We asked our correspondent in Poland to interview Government Press Spokesman Comrade Jerzy Urban on this issue. Here is the interview:

[Begin recording, in Polish with superimposed Russian translation] [Correspondent V. Belitskiy] In connection with the course and the outcome of the referendum, Western mass media have carried many conjectures and misinterpretations. How do you, as the government press spokesman, evaluate these questions?

[Urban] There have never been so many contradictory reports about Poland in the Western press. Hundreds of articles containing the most varied views have appeared. The fact that we actually published such results was emphasized with enormous surprise. And we were greatly praised by this. But I would say that such praise is insulting to the Polish authorities. I cannot even imagine how it would be possible to carry out a nationwide vote and not publish its results. As I say, they have been widely commented upon. Views appeared to the effect that the Polish authorities have allegedly lost the referendum, because we did not obtain more than 50% of positive answers from all those entitled to vote. But as two-thirds of those who participated in the voting said yes—and more than two-thirds of those entitled to vote did vote—the accusations and the claims that this is a defeat, even from the Western viewpoint, are absolutely groundless. After all, nowhere else have such high demands been placed upon the elections. If these criteria were applied to election practices in the West, not a single Western government would, indeed, be elected. The incumbent U.S. President, for whom 30% of citizens with the right to vote had voted, would not have been elected either. We have simply set our sights too high—as no other country has done—and this applies mainly to the condition that more than 50% of those entitled to vote said yes.

There were opinions in the West that this, on the contrary, represents total success. And in keeping with their own standards, the results of the referendum represent the support for the reform program. There were also many commentaries on why precisely this kind of results were obtained. The authors of these commentaries were especially astonished at the fact that the Poles answered the second question. And you know that there were two questions. One concerned the pace of economic reforms and the second concerned the procedures of democratization. And the biggest amazement was caused by the fact that not all the people gave their support to further democratization. This is commented on in many ways and one ought to perceive the results as they are.

Not everyone in Poland is an admirer of absolute democracy. There exist various viewpoints based on various reasons regarding this topic. The West utterly rejects this, because this is in contradiction to their views of Poland and of the socialist countries as a whole, as if absolutely everybody has to proceed from the common understanding of the democratic mechanism. And, let us say, on this issue there is not and there cannot be any contradiction within society. The West has perhaps never been so contradictory in evaluating the events in Poland.

[Beletskiy] and what about the atmosphere in which the referendum was carried out? There were also many reports in the Western press about some kinds of disparities. How was it really like?

[Urban] While the voting was in progress, the West tried with all its might to blow up absolutely insignificant phenomena. If four of the so-called opposition members—precisely four and not more—appeared in front of one of the country's 20,000 polling stations, this was reported as a world sensation. And these kinds of things—peanuts, so to speak—were searched for. But on the whole, the atmosphere during the voting represented an absolute surprise to them. In the first place, they expected either a boycott or the referendum being reminiscent of parliamentary elections and that there would be far more participants and that everybody would be in favor, of course. They do not understand that referendum means something else, an altogether different and not obligatory way of voting, that people have not grown accustomed to this in our country. And the problems connected with it do, indeed, evoke most varied feelings because it was stated directly before the referendum that

the program of economic reforms envisages a price increase next year of 40%, a price increase of basic foodstuffs by 110%, and of gas and electricity by 200%.

Do those who report these intentions want to lose? After all, this was simply ordinary honesty on our part with regard to the citizens. Our economic concept envisaged such sharp price increase, in order to cut subsidies and simultaneously increase wages. And if we concealed this, then the people who voted for the reform would think that they were cheated. As is known, both the head of government and the parliament itself unequivocally emphasized at the last session of the Sejm that we will in an absolutely determined manner head for the reform because we consider that the public support in favor has been enlisted. Two-thirds of voters, this means those who took up an active position, supported it. At the same time, the Sejm decided that it is necessary to take into consideration the fact that not all spoke for it, that only around 45% of those having the right to vote voiced their active support. This is why certain changes are being entered in the government statement. They are, unfortunately, being entered. This means that in keeping with the will of voters, the pace and the radical nature of the reforms will be softened. In short, the price increase will not be so abrupt right away and the prices will be raised gradually, although this will, of course, entail consequences which will slow down the pace and the effect of the reform.

[Beletskiy] But have its other principles been preserved?

[Urban] Yes, the main principles have been preserved.

[Beletskiy] Thank you very much. [end recording]

[Korzin] Well, these were, in my view, highly detailed and well-argued answers. I would like to add to this that the Polish Sejm marshall has already reported that the draft budget, in which the referendum results will definitely be reflected, will be presented to the Sejm for approval.

## Polish Consular Agency Opened in Lvov

*AU111215 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 2 Dec 87 p 3*

[Interview with Wlodzimierz Woskowski, head of the Consular Agency of the Polish People's Republic in Lvov by Zh.Rudenko, PRAVDA UKRAINY correspondent in Lvov: "At a Crossing of Cooperation"—boldface passage as published]

[Excerpt] **In the picturesque courtyard of an old house at the corner of Ivan Franko and Parkhomenko Sts, until recently, construction operations were in progress. But now the scaffolds have been removed, the site has been cleaned up, and a nice two-storeyed detached house has appeared before the eyes of the passer-by. At the entrance, there is a sign saying: "The Consular Agency of the Polish People's Republic."**

What is the mission of this Lvov section of the consulate general of the Polish People's Republic in Kiev?

"There is a great deal to do," Wlodzimierz Woskowski, agency chief, said. "After all, the new representation has proved to be of great importance both for Polish and Soviet citizens. Let us take, for example, the following fact. Thousands upon thousands of motor vehicles with citizens of the Polish People's Republic cross the Polish-Soviet frontier at Shegin checkpoint in Lvov Oblast. And anything may happen to a traveler: He may lose his documents, become sick, be involved in an accident, or confronted with unexpected circumstances. Before, it was necessary, in all such cases, to apply to our representatives in Moscow and Kiev. As you can see, this distance has now been significantly reduced."

[Zh. Rudenko] **Consequently, you issue visas, discharge notarial duties, protect the economic and legal rights of your compatriots...**

[Woskowski] Yes, for them we are here as representatives of the people's authorities of their own state with all the corresponding functions and powers. There are several thousands of Polish specialists engaged in west Ukrainian oblasts. In the future, the number of builders, power engineers, gas workers, and people of other trades will significantly increase. Last but not least, people get married and stay here as citizens of their own country.

[Zh. Rudenko] **You said that the Soviet people showed interest in the activity of the Lvov consular agency of the Polish People's Republic.**

[Woskowski] At the moment, there is an elderly couple in our waiting room. They want to make a trip to Poland where their son fought and fell in a battle against the fascists. In the Polish People's Republic, there are 613,000 graves of this kind, and each of them is etched in human memory. Many people come here to ask what arrangements have to be made to go abroad or to invite Polish friends, as well as to get first-hand information about developments in the Polish People's Republic, and about the progress made by ourselves in the construction of socialism and in the renewal of society following the 10th PZPR Congress.

As a result of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's meeting with Wojciech Jaruzelski last April, links between the Poles and the Soviet people have become increasingly warm and informal, and many procedures have been simplified. Naturally enough, our agency will contribute toward strengthening the fraternal friendship, toward expanding cultural, scientific, and sports contacts. We are planning to organize art and photography exhibits, concerts by Polish artists, our film shows, and joint sports competitions.

[Zh. Rudenko] **Comrade consul, what have you already managed to accomplish in such a short time?**

[Woskowski] I have made an attempt at a kind of "revision" of business-like contacts between Lvov Oblast and the sister Polish voivodships, Krosno and Przemysl. There are friendly relations and competitions between our individual enterprises and labor collectives. There are some which have begun to cooperate directly. In this respect, however, there is still much formalism. Along with comrades from the Soviet-Polish Friendship Society, we are now planning to work properly to instill more energy and vigor into relations between related enterprises. After all, what we are after is not diplomatic piety, but real collective work to consolidate socialism.

[Zh. Rudenko] **Most likely, problems have already emerged, too.**

[Woskowski] I would not call them problems. Instead, these are tasks which must be accomplished without delay. For example, we have a check point at the border between Lvov Oblast and the Polish People's Republic. The number of motor vehicles passing through it daily reaches an average of several thousand. In the "peak" season the line of waiting automobiles is very long.

Many people travel with children. The person behind the steering wheel does not sleep, smokes, and often drinks coffee to keep awake and not to miss his or her turn.... Is this waiting time not too long? In my opinion, some new "transit windows" should be opened. Along the tourist route, we would like to see as soon as possible service facilities with spare parts both for Soviet and Polish automobiles. [passage omitted]

[Zh. Rudenko] **You speak Russian very well, Comrade Woskowski....**

[Woskowski] It would be surprising if I did not. At home, I held party jobs for nearly 19 years, and then I spent 8 years in the Soviet Union, at first as a counsellor at the Polish Embassy, and then as deputy consul general in Kiev. And now I have been posted in Lvov. The Russian language enjoys a particular respect in my family. Both my daughters studied in Moscow, at basic and higher schools, and their husbands also received higher education there.

My granddaughter Beatka visited me in Lvov recently, and no one could tell her from the other children in the neighborhood. The Soviet Union is near and dear to us all.

## West Europe

### French Reaction to Missile Treaty Mixed

*PM111511 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Dec 87 Morning Edition p 4*

[Own correspondent Yu. Kovalenko report: "Chance for Europe"]

[Text] Paris—The signing of the Soviet-American Treaty on the Elimination of Medium-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles has aroused a broad response in France and prompted an avalanche of commentaries in the press and numerous responses by politicians and public figures. "A spring of peace has superseded the nuclear winter," L'HUMANITE wrote. A reproduction of the Soviet-American treaty with the signatures of M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan covered the entire front page of LIBERATION under the word "Historic."

President F. Mitterrand has again spoken in its support. "Disarmament," he stressed, "is a guarantee of peace on the condition that it is verified, balanced, and simultaneous." "I have made my choice," the president said. "We must disarm."

According to Prime Minister J. Chirac, the treaty is positive, of course, but only if it is followed up by other treaties which will make it possible to strengthen security in Europe and the rest of the world. This treaty alone cannot guarantee security in Europe. Strategic arms must also be the subject of an agreement. Then this will be a historic event, according to the French prime minister.

This is what I was told by Pierre Messmer, former prime minister and chairman of the Rally for the Republic party group in the National Assembly: "It is a very important event, because this is the first treaty in mankind's history that actually reduces nuclear arsenals. Agreements have been signed in the past which have only limited the level of nuclear weapons but not destroyed them. The Soviet-American treaty provides for elimination of missiles with a range of between 500 and 5,500 km, which will carried out under strict verification and within definite deadlines. There can be no doubt that this is a far-reaching decision. A first step has been taken, which is not only significant in itself but also important because it will be followed by others. I hope that progress will continue to be made along the road that has been opened up and, in particular, that an accord will be reached on reducing strategic offensive weapons. As is well known, the arsenals of these weapons are vast and can be reduced without detriment to the security of either side."

On the whole, discordance can be felt in the right-wing camp, in which different, often directly opposed opinions are being expressed. Former French President V. Giscard d'Estaing has given a positive opinion on the Soviet-American treaty, describing it as a "success" and a "chance for Europe." But A. Giraud, French defense minister, who described the treaty as "another European Munich" several months ago, does not seem to have changed his views, if we are to judge by his most recent statements. And R. Barre, former prime minister and one of the candidates for the presidency, has said that elimination of medium-range and shorter-range missiles is bad for France and will undoubtedly lead to the weakening of nuclear deterrence. In his opinion, the Pershing missiles are an immutable link in the chain of deterrence, which must link Europe to the United States. Assessing the treaty, Foreign Minister J.-B. Raimond

reiterated that the Soviet Union still has, allegedly, a huge advantage in nuclear, conventional, and chemical weapons and that Soviet strategic offensive weapons pose a threat to the United States and West Europe. The main "danger," according to the minister, is that Moscow could draw everyone into a process that will lead to creation of a nuclear-free Europe and thereby weaken the bonds of security between the United States and the West Europeans.

Taking up the theory that eliminating medium-range and shorter-range missiles will weaken European defenses, the right-wing press has given a hostile reception to the signing of the treaty. "Europe Disarmed" ran the headline on LE FIGARO's front page. The prospect of totally eliminating nuclear weapons in Europe and the rest of the world strikes horror in the heart of A. Peyrefitte, chairman of the newspaper's editorial committee. "Reagan," the author of another publication echoes, "is the victim of Moscow propaganda."

Serious polemics therefore still surround the question of nuclear arms reduction, as far as France is concerned. But there are all the signs that the idea of destroying nuclear arsenals is gradually carving a path for itself.

### Marchais on French Reaction

*LD140936 Moscow TASS in English 0547 GMT 13 Dec 87*

[Text] Paris December 14 TASS—General Secretary of the French Communist Party Georges Marchais has declared in support of the Soviet-American agreement on the elimination of the intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles. Speaking in a program of the radio station Europe-1 on Sunday, he underlined the important role that the Soviet Union had played in attaining an agreement on that question.

Georges Marchais denounced the stand of Paris which, as different from other capitals of the world, received the treaty with restraint and stated that there was "danger" in a nuclear-free Europe. He expressed regret that the French leadership "had nothing to propose to the world but 'nuclear deterrence' now that the peoples are striving for disarmament." The leaders of the European countries should now think what can be done for progress in elimination of armaments, Georges Marchais underlined.

### Karpov in FRG Briefs Genscher on Summit

*LD122021 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1435 GMT 12 Dec 87*

[Text] Bonn 12 Dec (TASS)—Talks were held today in Bonn between FRG Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher and visiting Viktor Karpov, special representative of the CPSU Central Committee general secretary. He was delivering information on the outcome of the Soviet-U.S. summit in Washington, and he also set out the Soviet leadership's view of the prospects for disarmament and development of East-West relations.

There was an exchange of opinions on disarmament issues, and also on other questions discussed at the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. Genscher stressed that signing the treaty on eliminating medium- and shorter-range missiles is of historic importance. He spoke positively of the policy of the Soviet Union, which is being guided by the new way of thinking.

The two sides spoke in favor of continued steps on disarmament. They agreed in their belief that achievement of an accord on a 50% reduction in the strategic offensive weapons of the two superpowers in the first half of 1988 is not only essential but also possible. The participants in the conversation stressed the importance of signing an agreement on the general elimination of chemical weapons. According to an FRG Foreign Ministry report, Genscher termed interesting the Soviet proposals for reducing troops and weapons in Europe, which were set out by Karpov.

During the meeting, issues of relations between the USSR and the FRG were also discussed. As the FRG Foreign Minister stated, these relations are of central significance for the Federal Republic. He advocated their continued expansion and deepening.

Yuliy Kvitsinskiy, USSR ambassador to the FRG, took part in the talks.

### Parents To Visit Rust in Moscow Jail

*LD121343 Hamburg DPA in German 1234 GMT 12 Dec 87*

[Excerpt] Moscow, (DPA)—The 19-year-old Kremlin pilot, Mathias Rust, from Wedel near Hamburg is to be allowed to see his parents before Christmas. Rust's lawyer Vsevolod Yakovlev told DPA on Saturday that Monika and Karl-Heinz Rust had received a visa and permission to visit on 20 December. He himself will be seeing Mathias Rust as the Lefortovo detention center in Moscow on Monday or Tuesday.

In Yakovlev's view, Rust must spend at least 6 months in a labor camp before another appeal for a pardon has a chance of success. He will be discussing this with Rust, said his lawyer. Good conduct in the labor camp is, however, also important for a pardon. [passage omitted]

### Italian CP Leader Supports INF Treaty

*LD141129 Moscow TASS in English 1054 GMT 14 Dec 87*

[Text] Rome December 14 TASS—Alessandro Natta, general secretary of the Italian Communist Party (PCI), has expressed satisfaction with the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Washington and with the prospects which it opens up for further process of disarmament.

"Common sense triumphed in Washington", he said in a speech in the city of Udine. "These days the Italian Communists check their idological and political principles against the results of the meeting. We can be proud with good reason, since from the very outset we have been on the right side".

The PCI general secretary emphasized that obstacles in the path of disarmament still existed.

"The arsenals of weapons of various types still remain in Europe, and certain circles in the West advocate 'rearmament'. The new dialogue between the Soviet Union and the United States", Alessandro Natta pointed out, "provides a fine opportunity for Western Europe to make headway to realization of tension and security".

## Gorbachev's Book Published in Greece

*LD111016 Moscow TASS in English 0309 GMT 11 Dec 87*

[Text] Athens December 11 TASS—TASS correspondent Vladimir Malyshev reports:

The presentation of the book by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev PERESTROYKA: NEW THINKING FOR OUR COUNTRY AND THE WORLD took place here on Thursday evening. The book was brought out by Nea Sinora publishers in Greek. Prominent political figures, representatives of the public, workers in culture were present.

It is characteristic that the book by the Soviet leader was brought out in Greece precisely these days when the historic Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles was signed in Washington, the book's publisher I. Livani said in an interview to the TASS correspondent. "The book was brought out in a large imprint and immediately attracted great interest of our readers who want to know more about your country, about its peaceful policy which is most actively conducted by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. We are confident that the publication of Mikhail Gorbachev's book in Greece is also a contribution to the cause of peace," I. Livani said.

## Soviet Defects Across Norwegian Border

*LD131700 Stockholm Domestic Service in Swedish 1545 GMT 13 Dec 87*

[Text] A 33-year-old Soviet citizen from Murmansk has asked for political asylum in Norway, our correspondent in Oslo reports. On Friday night, the man crossed the Pasvik River on foot. This river forms the border between the Soviet Union and Norway. The 33-year-old man is now being questioned by the Oslo police.

## 'Witch-Hunt' Against Turkish Communists Hit

*PM140943 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Dec 87 Second Edition p 5*

[Report by own correspondent A. Stepanov: "'Witch-Hunt.' The Lives of Turkish Communists Under Threat"]

[Text] Ankara, 10 Dec—The lawyers of H. Kutlu, general secretary of the Turkish Communist Party Central Committee, and N. Sargin, general secretary of the Workers Party, have at long last been permitted to see their clients who are in a special block for political prisoners at the Ankara central jail. Immediately after the visit the lawyers, speaking on behalf of H. Kutlu and N. Sargin, told representatives of the press that both Turkish Communist leaders had been brutally tortured during interrogation sessions that the political police and security service have been carrying out since 16 November. They have been stripped naked and beaten and subjected to electric shocks; they have had icy water sprayed at them under high pressure; they have been suspended upside down by their feet; and they have had psychotropic drugs injected into them.

The period of custody, when the kind of methods of interrogation under torture often practiced in Turkey were used against H. Kutlu and N. Sargin, was specially extended in violation of the law in order to conceal signs of torture. No one was allowed to see them for three weeks. The lawyers also reported that H. Kutlu and N. Sargin had refused to sign the record of the interrogation that had been conducted in a special torture chamber.

After their meeting with H. Kutlu and N. Sargin, the two lawyers, A. Coskun and R. Oz, were arrested by the police, but 2 days later the police were forced to release them because of the unlawful nature of the arrest.

A group of lawyers, having circulated the description of what the Turkish Communists had gone through, made a resolute protest against the unprecedentedly tyrannical behavior of the authorities in blatantly flouting all legal norms. As is known, H. Kutlu and N. Sargin had openly returned home to found a legal United Communist Party which would contribute to the struggle for democracy and peace and in defense of working people's interests.

But a veritable nationwide hunt was mounted for members of the Communist and Workers Parties. The police and the security service are picking up all suspects. The number of detainees has now topped 100.

The police reign of terror has cast serious doubts on the entire process of so-called democratization. A commentary in the newspaper CUMHURIYET says that the government claims that Turkey has leaped an entire era in recent years as a result of economic liberalization and democratization. Well, the country certainly has leaped, but, apparently... into the Middle Ages.

The Turkish authorities are continuing to receive a flood of protests from abroad against the tyrannical treatment of H. Kutlu and N. Sargin and their comrades. Many Turkish newspapers have published the text of a statement by the CPSU Central Committee demanding the release of H. Kutlu and N. Sargin. In Turkey itself, despite the atmosphere of intimidation and over pressure on the progressive public, there is a widening movement in favor of an amnesty for political prisoners, of whom there are in excess of 50,000, and for the abolition of capital punishment.

The Turkish parliament was handed a petition by the Turkish society for the protection of human rights, signed by more than 100,000 citizens, demanding a general amnesty and the reestablishment of democratic norms.

In conversation with your PRAVDA correspondent, F. Saglar, general secretary of the main opposition party, the Social Democratic People's Party, said: "The detention and, even more so, the torture of H. Kutlu and N. Sargin are downright tyranny. After all, Turkey has signed all the international documents on human rights. You cannot detain people, let alone torture them, because of their beliefs. The government and the Ministry of Justice must see to it that the laws are observed. Unfortunately, in Turkey today the practice is that even freedom of thought is prohibited. We advocate full restoration of democratic freedoms, including the right to organize politically, and the state's unswerving observance of the letter and spirit of the law."

## Latin America & Caribbean

### CIA Involvement in Aid for Contras Reported

*LD131634 Moscow TASS in English 1544 GMT 13 Dec 87*

[Text] Managua December 13 TASS—American James Jordan Denby, whose plane was downed near the Nicaraguan city of San Juan del Norte on December 6, named in the course of the investigation more than 50 of his compatriots, who have land plots in Costa Rica and are associated with the counterrevolutionary activities by the Somozistas.

According to a NUEVA NICARAGUA AGENCY (ANN) report, Denby is a leading figure of the American colony in San Juan river valley, along [word indistinct] the border between Costa Rica and Nicaragua runs. These Americans control the contra operations on the "southern front" of the undeclared war waged by the U.S. Administration against Nicaragua. But the main figure in the colony is CIA agent John Hull, a Costa Rican citizen, ANN noted.

Denby was found in possession of documents attesting to his connections with the American ultrarightist organization Civilian Military Assistance, in particular with its chief Tom Posey. The fighting [words indistinct] of that group carry out together with the contras terrorist operations in Nicaragua's territory. Among the documents was also a map of the country's south, on which the areas of most intensive operations of the Somozistas are charted.

According to the ANN report, the investigatory authorities have material evidence of the American's involvement in drug trafficking. In the course of the investigation, information was obtained about the ties of the contras with traders in arms and narcotics.

Unlike American mercenary Eugene Hasenfus, whose plane was downed over Nicargua on October 5 last year, Denby is a major figure in the system of clandestine aid for the contras, which was set up by the U.S. secret services, Isolda Hurtado, a representative of Nicaragua's Home Ministry, said in an ANN interview. He was personally acquainted with Oliver North, a former member of the U.S. National Security Council, and his assistant Robert Owen. This, Hurtado said, makes it possible to hope for obtaining fresh important evidence of the criminal policy pursued by the USA vis-a-vis Nicaragua.

### Nicaragua's Ortega Cited on Opposition Parties

*LD140820 Moscow TASS in English 0541 GMT 14 Dec 87*

[Text] Managua December 14 TASS—The main task of the Nicaraguan working people at the present-day stage is to defend, arms in hand, the revolutionary gains and the Sandinist power which reflects the vital interests of the earlier oppressed classes. This was stated here by President of Nicaragua Daniel Ortega, speaking at the closing session of the National Trade Union Assembly.

As long as imperialism-imposed war continues in the country, its social and economic problems cannot be resolved, he said. The sooner we do away with the gangs of Somoza mercenaries, the sooner the war ends and a way out is found from economic difficulties. If there is the need of mobilizing all Nicaraguan working people to smash the contras, we shall have to do that, Ortega underlined.

While the Government of the Republic is exerting every effort to honour the Guatemala accords in order to bring durable peace to Central America, some oppositional parties are using the current political situation to form "an internal front" in Nicaragua, the president said.

The Government of Nicaragua respects the rights of civilian opposition but it will not allow them to become representatives of counterrevolutionary gangs, calling for direct U.S. aggression.

### Nicaragua's H. Ortega Cited on Peace Efforts

*LD121243 Moscow TASS in English 0750 GMT 12 Dec 87*

[Text] Managua December 13 TASS—"Nicaragua will make diplomatic and political efforts to achieve peace in the region and to carry on the fight against armed counter-revolutionaries while preparing to repulse a possible U.S. intervention and strengthening the republic's defence capacity", Humberto Ortega, Nicaraguan minister of defence stated here on Saturday in a speech at the Fifth National Assembly of Trade Union Organizations.

"The Somozistas suffer a military-political defeat", the minister pointed out. "In the face of the hirelings' defeat the Reagan administration counts on an escalation of the armed conflict through fanning up border incidents".

"Provocative sallies on the part of Honduras, and attacks on Nicaraguan ports and border points considerably gained in scope of late", Ortega said.

"The Reagan administration's unwillingness to solve regional issues on the basis of talks remains the main problem precluding a settlement of the situation in Central America", the minister said. "At the same time Nicaragua is always ready for bilateral and multilateral talks, with the participation of the United States and countries of the region, on the problems of reducing arms and achieving relaxation of tension".

### Obukhov Holds Talks With Fidel Castro

*LD131133 Moscow TASS in English 0728 GMT 13 Dec 87*

[Text] Havana December 13 TASS—Aleksey Obukhov, Soviet ambassador at large, has emphasized here a historic significance of the Soviet-American INF Treaty. Addressing a press conference, he said that he had arrived in Cuba on the instruction of the Soviet Government to inform the Cuban leadership of the results of the summit meeting held in Washington. With this in view he had conferred with Fidel Castro, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Cuba, chairman of the State Council and the Council of Ministers of the Republic.

Obukhov pointed out that during their meeting they had discussed in a comprehensive and detailed way the whole range of questions connected with Soviet-American relations, including arms reduction, human rights, humanitarian issues, the settlement of regional conflicts and bilateral relations.

### Mexican Socialist Party Congress Ends

*LD140957 Moscow TASS in English 0746 GMT 14 Dec 87*

[Text] Mexico City December 14 TASS—The congress of the People's Socialist Party of Mexico ended here on Sunday. It was attended by over 2,000 delegates. The congress summed up the results of the party's activities over a period of three years and outlined the course of struggle in defense of the interests of the Mexican working people. The delegates approved the report of the Party's Central Committee and adopted the election platform of the Socialist People's Party for the next summer presidential elections in Mexico.

The delegates highly assessed the foreign policy course of the USSR and other socialist countries aimed at ensuring durable peace in the world and establishing a comprehensive system of international security, the treaty, signed by the USSR and the USA, on the elimination of intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles.

The delegates firmly denouced the interference of U.S. imperialism in affairs of Central American peoples. They declared for a peaceful political settlement of problems of the region, in support of the policy of Nicaragua's Government and pledged solidarity with the struggle waged by the patriotic forces of El Salvador.

The congress elected the party's steering bodies—an 11-man national leadership (Secretariat) and the Central Committee (101 members). Jorge Cruikshank Garcia has been re-elected general secretary of the Central Committee of the Socialist People's Party.

## Political & Social

### Construction Industry Work Criticized

*PM081139 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Dec 87 Second Edition p 2*

[TASS report: "Builder, Time Is Pressing! At USSR Supreme Soviet Standing Commissions"]

[Text] Restructuring is making especially great demands on construction workers. It is no secret that many stagnation phenomena have accumulated in the sector. This largely determined the critical tone of the discussion at the joint session of the USSR Supreme Soviet chambers Construction and Construction Materials Industry Commissions held 4 December. It discussed progress in the implementation by the Ministry of Construction in Northern and Western Regions of the USSR of decisions to improve the efficiency and quality of construction work and ensure the commissioning of capacities and projects on schedule.

The deputies thoroughly examined the work of the sector at the end of the year. It was noted that priority has rightly been given to the social sphere. The targets for the first three quarters for labor productivity growth and the commissioning of housing, hospitals, health centers, and schools were fulfilled, but this is where the successes end. For projects in the metallurgical, agro-industrial, chemical and timber industry, and fuel and energy complexes the targets were not met. The shortfall is especially great in main administrations operating in Bryansk, Kirov, Novgorod, and Ryazan Oblasts. The main reasons for this have also been exposed: The implementation of measures to improve the economic mechanism is dragging on in the sector, and in many cases main administration and trust leaders display a formalistic attitude to the introduction of the collective contract. It was noted that the ministry is dragging its feet in preparing enterprises and organizations for the switch to full economic accountability [khozrashchet] and self-financing. Nonproductive expenditure is still high. Little is being done to disseminate progressive experience.

Deputies dwelt in detail on the state of affairs at enterprises, especially those which are called upon to ensure the uninterrupted functioning of the housing construction production line, and on problems in the spheres of design, supply of equipment, and cadre training. It was noted that housing construction combines are working at only 80% of their capacity. Meanwhile, construction workers, and they in particular, must remember that the provision of the working people with housing in areas within the sphere of competence of the Ministry of Construction in Northern and Western Regions of the USSR is lagging 10-15% behind the country's average.

The tone during the discussion of questions pertaining to labor organization in collectives on construction sites and at enterprise and the policy of thrift and savings was sharp. Deputies sharply criticized leaders of main administrations where resource-saving is still not a leading trend.

Special attention was paid to questions connected with improving construction workers' working, living, and leisure conditions. It was noted that poor production organization, inadequate use of progressive forms of this organization, and unsatisfactory housing, cultural, and everyday living conditions have had a negative effect on cadre turnover in some places. Cadre training also needs to be improved. Proposals to improve the economic education of enterprise and construction site workers and to instill in them a proprietory attitude were submitted.

In a collective effort recommendations were drawn up aimed at the elimination of the shortcomings in the capital construction sphere, improvements in the leadership of the sector by the Ministry of Construction in Northern and Western Regions of the USSR, and closer coordination of the efforts of construction workers and soviets of people's deputies. The adopted resolution emphasizes that the ministry must make a more specific effort to improve the economy of organizations under its jurisdiction in accordance with the stipulations of the USSR Law on the State Enterprise (Association).

The session was attended by P.N. Demichev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and leaders of a number of ministries and departments.

### New Kind of Enthusiasm Seen in CPSU Cadres

*PM021401 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Nov 87 Second Edition p 1*

[Valentin Loginov "Frank Discussion": "Different Times—Different Criteria"]

[Text] I often associate with party workers, and this is what I notice. Quite recently, it seems, the views of many of them on restructuring revealed a real enthusiasm for holding meetings, and this enthusiasm used to greet all kinds of innovations even at times of stagnation. They seemed very promising and striking innovations. But, unfortunately, they were mostly short-lived. As things had frequently been in the past? The echo of fine-sounding speeches and tumultuous applause had hardly died away before the enthusiasm died too, you see. And a pleasant lull ensued. Until the next campaign... But how do things stand now?

Today I sense increasingly palpably in the statements of the people I talk to both serious concern at the complexity and profundity of the transformations being implemented and growing determination, despite all the difficulties, to see through to the end what has been begun. It is increasingly noticeable that sloganizing nuances are disappearing from conversations on restructuring. A different kind of enthusiasm—not for meetings but a businesslike, working enthusiasm—is increasingly characteristic of the atmosphere in party committees.

Approximately 2 years ago, I remember, an acquaintance who is a raykom secretary shared a "discovery" of his. The previous day he had participated in a meeting of the rayon's working people with a group of writers from the capital. Addressing that meeting, a very well-known poet got up and proclaimed: The calls for restructuring are directed chiefly at those who "work badly," while those who have "worked well" in the past have no reason to be particularly worried about anything. That view of restructuring, enthusiastically presented, produced an impression, so to speak. Even on the party raykom secretary.

I rang him recently. I heard an eloquent admission:

"Restructuring has made me look anew at what is good and what is bad. I have been convinced myself, and I am endeavoring to convince my colleagues and the raykom aktiv, that acceleration cannot be achieved using old yardsticks to assess what has been accomplished."

Different times mean different criteria for work, different approaches to it, different assessments. Restructuring is, you will agree, a test of professional efficiency above all. The experience of its first stage teaches us that party workers have enhanced professional efficiency more noticeably than others precisely where they resolutely free themselves not only from imperative, bureaucratic methods which run counter to the spirit and essence of political leadership but also from the hypnosis of selectively collected figures and percentages.

We know that for years and decades many raykoms, gorkoms, and obkoms, tackling production affairs and, frequently, current affairs with the directness of controllers, adhered to the following principle in their assessments of the standard and quality of party organizations' activity: If a plant or factory fulfills the plans in terms of the "basic indicators," the party organization there is militant and up to the mark and, thus, deserves all possible praise. But what kind of plans are they? At what cost are they being fulfilled? Are the contract commitments being kept to in full? Does the output sell like hot cakes or is it known to be doomed to gather dust in warehouses? How and in what way, finally, do the vanguard role of Communists and the organizing role of the party committee specifically manifest themselves? Such "trifles" quite frequently simply were not taken into account. They merely received a routine fleeting mention.

On business trips I have repeatedly seen for myself how confidently, directly, and unhesitatingly many party workers cite figures for increases in production volumes and other economic indicators. But how can you disagree with those of them who believe that it is precisely overcoming "statistical" approaches that is almost the hardest thing in restructuring the style and methods of party leadership locally? True, you cannot analyze the state of affairs without solid statistical computations. However, they are not necessary in themselves—not even growth figures. You must be able in all instances, M.S. Gorbachev observed during his October trip to Leningrad, to answer confidently the question of what relationship the dynamics of figures of this kind has with the process of real growth in the working people's well-being, the improvement of their working and living conditions, the intensification of spiritual and cultural life, and the strengthening of order and discipline. In other words, it is important to learn without fail to see the person behind the figures in reports. Because restructuring advances him, the person, to the forefront.

PRAVDA's mailbag and its correspondents' reports contain much evidence of the difficulty with which new approaches are being assimilated locally and conservatism, inertia, and stagnation in thoughts and actions are being overcome. There are reports that certain raykoms and gorkoms are continuing to "draw in" literally all questions to themselves instead of finally tackling what is really their own business—mobilizing and uniting people through primary party organizations and cadres, through party control and organizational-political measures aimed at creating a healthy atmosphere saturated with the energy of renewal in the city, in the rayon, and in labor collectives. But democracy, glasnost, criticism, and self-criticism are increasing everywhere. Formalism, bureaucratic administration, and verbiage have been squeezed. Let us take into account another "special feature": In former times there would certainly have been no end of triumphant reports.

Was it long ago that we frequently encountered manifestations of the notorious report mania even among party workers, when discussion of a particular task was hastily passed off as its successful realization? Blind faith in the omnipotence of orders from above was held in too great esteem. Sometimes, in addition to everything else, the impression was created that it was virtually the chief concern of party committees to ensure the uninterrupted working of the conveyor belt which produces numerous texts of verbose speeches and resolutions, lists of measures, and so forth. This "conveyor belt," together with current concerns and conference mania, took up so much time, effort, and energy that in some places there was hardly any of these left for organizational and political activity and the practical implementation of what was planned.

These gaps too are being filled increasingly palpably in the course of restructuring. So there are fewer "reports." But is this the case everywhere? Let us recall how

severely the CPSU Central Committee June (1987) Plenum condemned the attempts by the Armenian Communist Party leadership to pass off what was desired as reality. It turned out that some people there even claimed that restructuring had begun in the republic even before April... You might think that there could be no more convincing lesson for those engaged in restructuring not in practice but in words. But no, it seems that not all have profited from the lesson.

In previous years I have repeatedly had occasion to visit Vladimir Oblast. I have quite frequently noticed how ardently and animatedly people there speak about successes but, conversely, how sparingly and seemingly unwillingly they respond to talk of laggardness in a particular sector. Today signs of restructuring are visible there too, just as they are everywhere. But it turns out that the worthless tendencies to ignore shortcomings and smooth sharp corners remain. Once again it took the CPSU Central Committee's "intervention" to make Vladimir Obkom face up, as it were, to one of the most important tasks of restructuring—the broadening of glasnost in work and the eradication of all attempts to embroider the existing reality and to hide miscalculations and mistakes in party and social practice under a cover of imaginary, ostentatious, professional efficiency.

The party persistently warns that, in carrying out restructuring, we must not plunge into dismay and depression when faced with negative phenomena nor, equally, go into raptures over every success. Still less a really exaggerated, embroidered, or totally invented success. The art of restructuring is a complex art. We must learn it without delay, as we go along, without waiting for any additional instructions. We must act.

"The time is past," Vladimir Ilich Lenin declared at one of the crucial times for the party, "when we had to depict the great tasks politically, and the time has come to carry them out in practice." Decades have passed, but it is as though Lenin's appeal were addressed to us. The present time is also particularly crucial. Very crucial!

## Primary Organizations' Role To Lead Reform

*PM031353 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Dec 87 Second Edition p 1*

[Editorial: "Collective's Political Nucleus. The Duty of Primary Party Organizations Is To Lead Restructuring at Local Level"]

[Text] The party organization of Leningrad's "Kirovskiy Zavod" Association has much good work to its credit. Developing the creative activeness of the thousands-strong collective, it persistently seeks to restructure not only economic management practice but also the forms and methods of party leadership and political influence on people. The association's Communists vigorously oppose smugness, complacency, sluggishness, and disorder, and exactingness regarding the fulfillment of plan targets and contractual obligations, discipline, order, and production standards and rhythm has become stricter. The party committee and the administration collaborate successfully, and the prestige of shop party organizations and party groups has increased. What is the result? The collective is steadily coping with the monthly plans and output deliveries according to contract.

That is just one example of how much is within the capability of CPSU primary organizations, which now number 442,000. Essentially all the problems of restructuring meet and closely interweave there, and its innovative ideas are transformed there into concrete achievements. The militancy and businesslike purposefulness of the primary party links, which act directly in the midst of the masses, and their ability to rouse and inspire people to resolve the creative tasks dictated by the time and to consistently ensure visible improvements in work are a reliable guarantee of restructuring's successful development.

The primary party organization is the labor collective's political nucleus. This means that it is wholly responsible for the state of affairs in the collective and for establishing a new moral and psychological atmosphere there. Gratifying changes in people's thinking, consciousness, and behavior are particularly noticeable wherever Communists' everyday life is characterized by democracy and openness in relations, glasnost in ideas and decisions, unity of word and action, and boldness in the struggle against conservatism and the penchant for harebrained schemes. The success of work also depends on how weighty the contribution made by party members in enterprises and farms to introducing progressive forms of labor organization and incentives and eradicating the braking mechanism and the bureaucratism, freeloading, and leveling that it "fosters" is. Primary party organizations are called upon to make skillful use of the opportunities which are opening up in connection with the transfer of labor collectives to full economic accountability, self-financing, and self-capitalization for instilling in people a sense of being masters and of involvement in common concerns.

The experience of the initial stage of restructuring teaches much. If the party organization has been able to secure a substantial breakthrough in its work, impart to it genuine creativity and revolutionary assertiveness, and thereby enhance the personal responsibility of every Communist for implementation of the projected line, then labor collective's affairs have forged confidently and irreversibly ahead. Conversely, thing's are going at a snail's pace wherever lack of initiative and inertia reign in the vanguard link.

Restructuring is not a stroll along smooth asphalt. On our road we encounter potholes, ruts, and barriers formed of the accretions of the past, and these may seem insurmountable to fainthearted people and those who are unaccustomed to "heavy work." Primary party organizations should not lapse into defeatist or overoptimistic moods. Cohesion of ranks, revolutionary endurance

and conviction of the correctness of the work begun, and unbending determination to overcome any barriers on the path to the goal—this is what should determine their position today.

However, party organizations are still not everywhere acting in the spirit of the present demands. When difficulties arise some of them, clearly slow to master the new approaches in organizational and ideological activity, attempt, in V.I. Lenin's words, "to get rid of the issue by means of loud exhortations."

For a long time the party committee of "Likinskiy Avtobusnyy Zavod" Association near Moscow, for example, reacted in this way to production and other disorders. Many speeches were made, many resolutions adopted—but unsolved problems still accumulated. The switch to state acceptance of output and then to the new principles of economic management exposed so many chronic ills and caused so many sharp conflicts that a collective that was once regarded as a leader was literally in turmoil. Only this, it seems, stirred the party committee to become seriously concerned. It has turned out that the party committee and its aktiv have to start almost from scratch in learning to openly raise and solve pressing problems, to maintain informal contact with ordinary Communists and nonparty people, to employ democratic methods in cadre work, and to effectively monitor the administration's work... Better late than never? Of course. But to waiting and then try to catch up—what kind of restructuring and acceleration is this?

The time requires that the primary party organizations' activity be urgently stepped up everywhere. In this respect the significance of the meetings and conferences which are being held here and at which the bureaus, party committees, and their secretaries are reporting on their work to lead restructuring is invaluable. Do the comrades in whom Communists have placed particular trust set the tone in restructuring? Does the party organization as a whole head the dynamic process of renewal or, to universal concern, lag behind it? How do its efforts affect the creative mood of the collective? Is there real progress in improving and democratizing production, strengthening discipline, and improving people's labor and life? The fate of the transformations that are under way depends on how frankly and profoundly the primary party organizations examine these and other issues that arise today in all their magnitude and on how clearly they formulate the tasks for tomorrow.

At party meetings and conferences it is important to maintain in every possible way the spirit of Bolshevik frankness, maximum glasnost and democracy, and constructive criticism and self-criticism and to resolutely stop continuing attempts to avoid controversial issues, to replace an exacting analysis with empty blather "about everything and nothing," and to squeeze the exchange of views into the framework of a prerehearsed scenario. It is the right and duty of the participants in the discussion, which is essentially the start of direct preparations for the 19th All-Union Party Conference, to give a proper appraisal both of enterprising and selfless fighters for restructuring and of those who are members of the bureau or party committee but do not lift a finger.

The primary party organizations have a special, extremely responsible role in the work to fundamentally renew all aspects of production and sociopolitical life and accelerate socioeconomic development. There is no doubt that if each of them fully mobilizes the potential for party influence on restructuring which it has at its disposal, all labor collectives will significantly step up their work. This is necessary now that the 2d year of the 12th 5-Year plan is on the home straight. It is precisely this which will be extremely necessary tomorrow and always. For restructuring is constant and, without fail, accelerating progress.

## Afanasyev Discusses Democracy, Glasnost

*PM131956 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Dec 87 First Edition p 2*

[V. Afanasyev article: "Democracy and Glasnost"]

[Text] Our time is a time of fundamental, revolutionary restructuring of Soviet society. The aim and meaning of the restructuring can be expressed in a brief and precise axiom: more socialism, more democracy.

Today we are translating this axiom of restructuring into the language of concrete practice, taking it to the places where it has to live and work—the collectives, taking it to people. People have to develop democracy comprehensively, they have to learn democracy, putting into practice the all-around progress of our society. The party of Communists heads and directs this process. Its own life and work are becoming increasingly democratic.

The press, radio, and television are powerful instruments of the restructuring, a platform of democracy and glasnost. The voice of the people rings out from that platform, rings out in tones that are frank, confiding, critical, revolutionary. "And how," V.I. Lenin wrote, "can an organ of advanced democracy be a nonmilitant organ in exciting times?" (Vol 48, pp 94-95.)

How can militancy and democraticness—those two markedly different principles—be combined?

Glasnost—that is the bridge linking these principles.

Glasnost means maximum openness in the work of party and soviet, economic and public organizations. It means the opportunity to voice an opinion on all questions of society's life. It means criticism of shortcomings and errors. Principled, constructive criticism. Openness for everyone and consideration of everyone's opinions—that is the democratic essence of glasnost.

Glasnost is incompatible with arrogance, conceit, secrecy, and indifference to people. It rejects bureaucracy, formalism, and paper-shuffling. Bureaucracy is the opposite of glasnost and democracy. It manifests itself most strongly where there is a lack of efficiency and monitoring from below, where people are not called to account for the task entrusted to them. Its essence lies in the fear of innovations, the longing for the old, the habit of following the well trodden path. The bureaucrat, V.I. Lenin wrote, is notable for his "monstrous timidity in the face of the smallest changes" (Vol 45, p 400).

What if we are not talking about "small" changes, but about the changes we are now experiencing? In that case timidity becomes a brake, it becomes conservatism. How can these be eradicated? The means to do this exist. They include the radical reform of the economic mechanism, the deepening and widening of democracy, the imposition of order everywhere and in everything, the heightening of discipline, organization, and responsibility. They include the establishment everywhere of a Leninist style of thinking and acting—a businesslike, militant, creative style; a restless, critical style; a style free from self-satisfaction and bragging; a style in which word and deed are one; a profoundly democratic style.

Can the mass information media stand aloof from this? The answer is unequivocal—no! I do not want to offend those who are charged with the right to lead collectives, among them there are many true enthusiasts for the restructuring, honest, competent people who really care about the cause. But we know that there are also those who are used to sweeping the dirt under the carpet, going in for window dressing, and tolerating misdemeanors and sometimes even crimes, who are fond of pulling the wool over people's eyes, dazzling them, and painting black white. That is the practice of certain leaders. The practice of antiglasnost, glasnost inside out.

We need the press, V.I. Lenin wrote, "to uncover shortcomings in the economic life of every labor commune, mercilessly hold these shortcomings up to shame, bring out into the open all the blemishes on our economic life, and thus appeal to the public opinion of working people to heal these blemishes" (Vol 36, p 147).

Perhaps the most widespread form of the struggle against glasnost is the suppression of criticism. People seem to acknowledge, even to encourage it verbally, but in practice? Not infrequently, this is what happens: After press criticism, those who are criticized, instead of setting about analyzing the reasons for the shortcomings and finding ways to eliminate them, start digging into the histories of those doing the criticizing, looking for any murky areas or transgressions in their work and life. And when they find something, or sometimes unscrupulously make up something, then they punish the critic. The range of punishments is quite broad—from a warning to prison bars. There have been many items in the press on this score. Decisions have been taken at the highest party level on a number of them.

Nor does it speak well for the establishment of glasnost in our life that a significant proportion of personal cases involving leaders are examined not in the labor collectives they head, but in higher instances. Yet the CPSU Statutes state clearly that a Communist who has committed a misdemeanor must answer for it first of all to the primary party organization.

In the event of a Communist being subjected to party proceedings by a higher organ, the Statutes say, the primary party organization must be informed.

Unfortunately, it is not always informed. That means that the collective remains ignorant of its leader's transgressions. This in turn leads to misinterpretations and conjectures.

Sometimes a leader is removed, without it being reported. Usually they say that this or that leader who has erred gravely was released from his duties "in connection with his transfer to other work" or in connection with his "retirement." Again there are misinterpretations and conjectures. Moreover ideas about the impunity of leaders begin to form, the sense of justice is lost, and the authority of those in high positions is undermined ("some people higher up protect people lower down").

There is a most important criterion in assessing leaders of party, economic, soviet, and public organizations, not excluding creative organizations. It is the attitude to restructuring and the concrete contribution to the resolution of its tasks. This contribution is measured not in figures, because figures can be deceptive, but in action, in concrete results. Conclusions should be drawn with the utmost frankness and honesty.

Let the public judge "who's who" in the restructuring, let them support any tangible contribution to it, however small, and condemn any "anticontribution." Let them see who is "for" and who is "against," not in words (you won't find many cranks like that), but in deeds. Let them assess deeds and actions from a human viewpoint, in human terms. Let them assess, condemn, and if necessary support and suggest what should be done to make things better for people.

The PRAVDA article "The Standard of Debate" (3 August 1987) called forth a mass of reactions. Both for and against!

It was noticed in the West and assessed as an attempt by PRAVDA to seize glasnost by the throat and stop the mouths of the critics of our past and present.

This must be resolutely rejected.

All the same, the question remains. Whom does PRAVDA come out against consistently—perhaps not always with journalistic brilliance?

Those who try, under the banner of democracy and glasnost, to blacken our glorious history, defend parochial, group, and sometimes even personal interests, pin offensive labels on their opponents, and restrict glasnost to criticism alone, pushing constructive work into the background.

Criticism helps the cause, and it is not a question of muffling criticism, still less stopping it. But restructuring does not live by glasnost alone. Today, in its second stage, it is extremely important to gather in the positive experience of restructuring piece by piece. There is not very much of it yet, but it exists. We are trying to show it in our regular rubrics "We Tell You About the First Secretaries," "Living by Conscience," "PRAVDA Survey: How Is the Restructuring Going?," "Radical Reform: What Are We Taking Into the New Year?," the "Business Club" items, and others.

Since the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum the critical work of the press has gathered speed. But, while developing and encouraging criticism, the party also comes out against all demagoguery, excesses, one-sidedness, and factionalism. Socialist democracy and glasnost can accept only one method of talking with people—the method of persuasion, and only one form—dialogue based on equal rights.

"The democratization of society," M.S. Gorbachev said in his report to mark the 70th anniversary of October, "is the heart of the restructuring, and how it goes will determine the success of the restructuring itself and, it is no exaggeration to say, the future of socialism as a whole." He called again and again for mastery of the "ethos of socialist democratism."

And what does mastering the ethos of democracy mean? It seems to us that it means, not least, mastering the ethos of debate. After all, debate, the exchange of opinions, comparing different viewpoints and positions and choosing the best, is the paramount quality of glasnost and democracy.

Glasnost is incompatible with the assertion of purely subjective opinions or factionalism, with being used to settle personal scores, take reprisals against people who are inconvenient to you, or suppress criticism. It precludes conscious sympathies and antipathies, the automatic designation of idols and anti-idols, heroes and antiheroes. Everyone is equal before glasnost, regardless of who holds what post or who does what (big or small) job.

Of course, tolerance and the ethos of debate in its most profound sense are totally incompatible with appeasement and the unprincipled exchange of favors. Principles are principles, and cannot be yielded.

The intelligent, skillful, well founded defense of Marxist-Leninist, Soviet, and common human principles—that is the task which our party Central Committee sets the press.

Glasnost cements and integrates the principles of party-mindedness, militancy, and democraticness. It is the highest manifestation of democracy, and an equally important means of establishing it and spreading it everywhere.

The question of glasnost is a political question, because without glasnost there is and can be no democracy, political creativity by the masses, or active participation by them in the management of society's affairs. Glasnost is a necessary condition, a guarantee of a state-minded attitude by hundreds of thousands of people to the cause, an attitude permeated with the spirit of responsibility, the sense of being the country's master. We must make glasnost an unfailing system of taking into account the thoughts and actions of people centrally and locally, because Soviet people want to know and should know what is being done both on a unionwide scale and in the republics, oblasts, and rayons.

Glasnost is fairness, accuracy, and promptitude in what is reported to the reader. The aim of glasnost is to make Soviet people better informed, more erudite, more convinced, more confident of the rightness of our cause. "We must," V.I. Lenin said, "be open in all our propaganda and agitation" (Vol 43, p 58).

Broad glasnost, openness in all spheres of public life gives people clear, realistic ideas of the state of affairs in various sectors, of the tasks facing the individual, the collective, the country, of the difficulties, shortcomings, and mistakes. It helps to nip in the bud all kinds of rumors and fabrications, and sometimes tittle-tattle.

Naturally, glasnost presupposes merciless criticism of negative phenomena which are incompatible with socialist democracy, law, and morality. But it also, we repeat, means uncovering leading experience, disseminating it widely, and publicizing our successes.

The press keeps an eye on the state and progress of what we might call negative glasnost: It waits for reactions to critical articles and the adoption of effective measures, sometimes it hurries people along, and sometimes it publishes a second or even third item. In a word, the progress of reports of this kind is monitored.

But positive glasnost often escapes our attention and goes unmonitored. People write about leading experience, an invention, or a discovery, and then, as a rule, they forget it. Yet the experience is not being disseminated, which means that the country is not receiving the sometimes vast benefit which it could and should receive. We journalists must amend this important work.

Glasnost is incompatible with half-truths, with substituting one half-truth for another, one group or clan for another. The criterion and meaning of glasnost is truth and only truth.

Democracy, glasnost, truth in all its manifestations—criticism and self-criticism, businesslike criticism focusing attention not on gloating over shortcomings, blunders, and mistakes (unfortunately, we have plenty of them), but on seeking ways and means of overcoming them—that is the sign of our times, of the restructuring, the acceleration of the country's socioeconomic development.

Our minus points, errors, mistakes—that is only part, and a small part, of the truth. The main part is that through truly heroic efforts by the people under the leadership of the glorious party of Communists, the Land of the Soviets has become a mighty power, in both economic and defense terms, which must be reckoned with and is reckoned with throughout the world.

Communists and Soviet people support the party's course of restructuring and acceleration. They are prepared to do everything to ensure that this course is successfully put into practice. The practical implementation of the ideas and principles of restructuring is the main characteristic of its present stage. It is important to offer scope for people's creative labor, the opportunity to take part in making decisions, organizing their implementation, and monitoring their fulfillment.

Here the press is called upon to play a great part. We must make our pages and our radio and television more widely available to those who are actually creating material and spiritual assets—workers and kolkhoz members, doctors and teachers, engineers, scientists, and party, soviet, and economic workers. The main say is theirs.

Glasnost presupposes not only uttering words, but putting them into practice. Otherwise it becomes a talking shop. The gulf between words and deeds, that old disease of ours, is still in evidence.

Certain ministries and departments are tackling the new tasks by the old, bureaucratic and conservative methods. With one hand they give the enterprises and associations broader and broader rights, and with the other they write all kinds of codes and instructions to restrict these rights. They talk about a turn toward the social sphere, toward people, their needs and interests, but in practice they continue to develop this most important sphere on the basis of the same old leftover principle that was sharply condemned at the 27th CPSU Congress.

The 27th CPSU Congress elaborated an integral, strong social policy and mapped out a radical turn toward the tackling of human and social problems. It is the duty of Soviet journalists to help the party successfully to put this policy into practice.

We press workers must cultivate in Soviet people a conviction of the necessity for and success of the restructuring and acceleration. And we must work without too much emotion or fuss, with restraint, thoughtfulness, and energy.

We journalists are children of our time. We were raised and molded in specific conditions. We have a past, we live in the present, and, naturally, we look to the future. Whether we like it or not, the burden of the past still weighs us down, and we are responsible to some extent for the stagnation processes which accumulated in Soviet society.

It is important for us to recognize this, not for the sake of repentance, but for the sake of purging ourselves fully and unreservedly of the burden of the past, for the sake of assimilating the new things that today has to offer us; for the sake of the struggle for these new things; for the sake of the future; for the sake of restructuring; for the sake of acceleration.

## Saratov Obkom Discusses Restructuring

*PM301133 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Nov 87 Second Edition p 2*

[Correspondent A. Vorotnikov report: "According to the Strict Demands of the Time: Saratov CPSU Obkom Reports at Plenum on Work To Lead Restructuring"]

[Excerpts] Saratov City—The preparation for this plenum began a long time ago, more than 3 months back. And with good reason: The question under discussion was an unusual one—the party obkom bureau's report on work to lead restructuring. Of course a new approach to the holding of the plenum was needed in order to examine everything in depth, to give an exacting assessment of the elected party organ's activity, and to resolve urgent cadre questions.

What happened? First a wide range of party activists was involved in the preparation. Secretaries, department workers, and obkom members visited many labor collectives and noted their opinion on the party committee's work. Bureau members also met with secretaries of party organizations, soviet and economic leaders, and party and labor veterans. In addition, the oblast newspaper KOMMUNIST published questionnaires and asked all readers to put forward their remarks and suggestions on the course of restructuring. And, finally, advance highlights of the report were sent to obkom members.

The ideas and valuable advice offered by many people were reflected in the report delivered by CPSU Obkom First Secretary A. Khomyakov. The bureau's attention, he said, centers on the crucial areas of restructuring—the democratization of social life and the radical economic reform. The plenum held a frank discussion on these key problems about Saratov people's successes and failures, where the bottlenecks are, and how to implement the set tasks more quickly. [passage omitted]

The question of the party Obkom Bureau's role was raised. What is it doing to disseminate the best experience of party work and to establish a modern and efficient style everywhere? To date clearly not enough. The study of concrete experience of restructuring at local level is poor and new forms and methods of work are slow to be adopted. The bureau usually prefers to seek explanations for failures rather than find ways to prevent them. In the speakers' opinion, the Obkom Bureau and apparatus are largely responsible for the fact that in a number of towns and rayons real restructuring has still not begun and that organizational slackness, indifference, and complacency are to be found in the activity of some leaders.

Special responsibility for renewal rests on primary party organizations. They are the nub of restructuring. It is there, in workplaces, that the fate of restructuring is settled above all. Unfortunately, far from all primary party organizations have increased their contribution. Evidence of that was provided both by speeches at the plenum and by the results of the survey conducted at a number of enterprises by the CPSU Obkom in conjunction with the Higher Party School. A large number of those questioned believe that the work of party committees and the party bureau does not meet the requirements of restructuring, that there is too much paperwork generated by their activity, and too many meetings are held (that is the opinion of 52%), that real work is replaced by mere formality (50%), and that little attention is paid to strengthening order and discipline (46%).

In brief, the Obkom Bureau was fairly criticized for poor leadership of restructuring in primary party organizations. The training of secretaries and the aktiv must be improved considerably. It is still rare for obkom workers to visit labor collectives, and when they do they confine themselves to general advice and instructions. For example, since the beginning of this year more than 50 people from the obkom have visited farms in Engelskiy Rayon. But the gain from those visits appears to be small.

The Main Area of Work [subhead]

Plenum participants paid much attention to resolving the key economic and social tasks. It was noted that certain improvements have taken place in the work of the obkom and its bureau in this respect. A more thorough approach has been adopted to the analysis of urgent and long-term problems. The time makes it necessary to work considerably more vigorously. Democracy, glasnost, criticism, and self-criticism are being strengthened all the time. A number of targeted programs are being implemented in the oblast under the leadership of party organizations. Preparations are in hand to transfer most enterprises to self-capitalization and self-financing. In the current 5-year plan, as speakers noted, the production of industrial goods has increased in volume, gross production of crop and livestock output has risen, and working and everyday living conditions have improved. Those are real steps toward renewal.

At the same time, the plenum noted that the restructuring of the work of the Obkom Bureau and departments lags behind today's requirements and practical actions do not always correspond to the scale and urgency of the problems that have arisen. Many people cling to outmoded approaches and the supplanting of soviet and economic organs has not been fully eradicated. All this indicates that the force of inertia is still great and that people are content to use only those reserves which are easily accessible. The Obkom Bureau and secretariat are regrettably still not paying day-to-day attention to the assimilation of new economic management methods. Party organizations are failing to provide effective monitoring of the implementation of a modern technology policy. Is that not why the oblast has accumulated a stock of uninstalled equipment worth R190 million?

The improvement in output quality in Saratov is also quite slow. Plants and combines are still producing quite a lot of shoddy goods. [passage omitted]

The plenum noted that the Obkom Bureau has taken measures aimed at raising the organizational and technical standard of construction and developing its base. The second power unit at the Balakovskaya AES and other production capacities have been commissioned this year and increased attention has been paid to social, cultural, and consumer facilities. But real restructuring has still not taken place in the oblast. While the oblast has fulfilled the plan as a whole, individual construction organizations have allowed a backlog to build up and each year fail to assimilate R15 million-R20 million in capital investments. The phenomenon of "never-ending construction" is causing grave concern. The construction of the "Slovakiya" Hotel and the veterinary institute has been going on for over 10 years now and the construction of the House of Knowledge and Consumer Service Center in Kirovskiy Rayon is also slow.

The Obkom Construction and Land Reclamation Departments have not achieved a breakthrough in land renewal, either. This is the 2d year that plans for the commissioning of new irrigated land have not been fulfilled and the pace of drainage work remains slow.

The food problem was among the main problems which attracted the special attention of plenum participants. Intensive techniques, the collective contract, and economic accountability have helped to increase gross agricultural output by 12% in the current 5-year plan.

Nevertheless, work in the agro-industrial complex leaves much to be desired. The cultivation of grain, sunflowers, and potatoes has fallen, losses during harvesting and storage are high, and the development of the processing industry is weak. One farm in four is loss-making. This is a direct criticism of party Obkom Second Secretary I. Ivanov, who is in charge of this important sector, Bureau Candidate Member K. Ponomarev, who is the Oblast Agroprom chairman, and Obkom Department Chief Yu. Ageyev.

The real fruits of restructuring are judged by people primarily according to the improvement in their working conditions, the operation of stores and consumer services, and other changes in the social sphere. The people of Saratov have seen improvements in this area. However, the obkom has been unable to solve completely all the accumulated problems here. The pace and quality of housing construction does not at present meet modern requirements. Comprehensive provision of settlement centers with services and utilities has still not been established. Poor work by the municipal services, health care, transport, and telephone communications gives rise to serious complaints. There are many shortcomings in trade.

Personal Contribution [subhead]

The main speaker and those who took part in debate provided quite a thorough assessment of the work of the party Obkom Bureau and each of its members. Much depends on the party staff—the dynamism of restructuring, work in the economy, the increasing of glasnost, and the development of democracy. That is why those who are part of the staff must not only possess a sense of high responsibility and initiative but must also be principled, objective, and intolerant of shortcomings. Party influence will strengthen still more if every member and candidate member of the bureau and department chief is an active participant in restructuring in his assigned area. The personal contribution people make is thus very important. What sort of contribution is being made?

V. Mikhaylov, first secretary of Balashov Gorkom:

"The Obkom Bureau and its departments are today undergoing a test of their maturity. It is essential to note the main thing, namely, that restructuring here has become irreversible. The style and methods of work of the Obkom Bureau are changing in connection with this. The number of conferences and sessions and the amount of information to be reported are being reduced. Discussion of issues is generally collegial in nature. Party gorkoms and raykoms are being given greater autonomy. We must regard the bureau's role in restructuring primarily from the standpoint of how our grassroots links, the labor collectives of enterprises, rayons, and cities, work..."

There, as Vyacheslav Fedorovich went on to remark, not everything is fine. At times the assistance of the obkom and its workers is sorely needed at local level. But it is not, unfortunately, always received. Mikhaylov cited the following case: The plant producing truck and tractor trailers has been in turmoil for a long time now. The USSR Ministry of Motor Transport bears quite a share of the blame here. The gorkom leaders have repeatedly asked the ministry for help. But all in vain. They came to the obkom to see V. Dolgopolov and Yu. Krakhmalev, chiefs of the Transport and Communications Department and Machine Building Department respectively, and also G. Anfinogentov, secretary of the obkom. They promised to investigate it all and help, but as yet nothing has been done.

G. Katushev, first secretary of Engels Gorkom:

"I consider it necessary to point out that Obkom Secretary K. Murenin, who is in charge of construction, shows great concern for this sector and keeps us on our toes, as the saying goes. However, things, once started, are not always seen through. As a result the state of work on projects can satisfy no one. And there are a particularly large number of problems in housing construction..."

The following, among others, also spoke in detail about the personal contribution made by bureau members and candidate members to the work of the oblast party organization: V. Kartashov, first secretary of Saratov Raykom; V. Trushin, first secretary of Lysogorskiy Raykom; T. Lipatova, leader of a team of poultry raisers at the Yelshanskiy Poultry Factory; A. Bogomolov, rector of Saratov's N.G. Chernyshevskiy University; and I. Naydenov, chairman of the Oblast Trade Union Council. Speakers noted not only the positive features in their work but also sharply criticized shortcomings and omissions. Here are a few of the assessments made:

"Obkom Secretary G. Anfinogentov does not show persistence in ensuring that collectives master economic management methods and introduce the achievements of scientific and technical progress and measures to enhance the effectiveness of production and quite often allows a discrepancy between word and deed to occur."

"I. Kuznestsov, chief of the Main Administration for Water Construction in the Central Volga Region and candidate member of the Obkom Bureau, tries to cover a broad range of problems, but in so doing fails to organize the work of the management apparatus with due efficiency and permits lack of coordination and cohesiveness."

"I. Ivanov, second secretary of the obkom and responsible for agricultural issues, is not exacting enough toward cadres with regard to ensuring the comprehensive development of agro-industrial enterprises, the more rational use of capital investments, strict observance of discipline, and a search for progressive ways of resolving problems."

"N. Aleksandrov, member of the Obkom Bureau and chairman of the oblispolkom, is not increasing demands on subordinate organizations sufficiently. The oblispolkom leadership does not always assume full responsibility for the implementation of economic and social development plans and still tries to shift responsibility for solving complex problems onto party organs."

"All the shortcomings in the CPSU Obkom Bureau's leadership of restructuring are primarily due to its first secretary, A. Khomyakov. He should be more exacting and step up demands on secretaries, department chiefs, and leading cadres for the performance of their duties, prompt execution of party decisions and assignments to a high standard, and the instilling of order and discipline in all areas of work."

...Yes, the complex and multifaceted process of restructuring demands that every oblast party organization leader show greater initiative and responsibility and a more critical attitude to his work. The plenum's frank and principled discussion of the Saratov Obkom Bureau's report demonstrates the increased demands Communists are making on work in the oblast and their exactingness and uncompromisingness toward shortcomings, omissions, and slackness. The assessment of the work of the party committee is based on its attitude to restructuring and the renewal of all aspects of the life of society and the actual work done in carrying out the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress.

### Kirghiz CP Plenum Discusses Admissions Policy

*PM071615 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Dec 87 Second Edition p 2*

[Own correspondent Yu. Razgulyayev report: "Plenum Held"]

[Text] Frunze, 4 Dec—A Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee plenum was held today. A report "On the Work of the Republic's Party Organizations on Admissions to the Party and the Strengthening of Party Ranks in the Light of the Demands of the 27th CPSU Congress" was delivered by G. Kiselev, second secretary of the Central Committee.

The plenum participants also listened to and discussed reports from S. Begaliyev, chairman of the Kirghiz SSR Gosplan, and A. Sydykov, first secretary of Osh party gorkom, on their fulfillment of the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee June and January (1987) Plenums.

The plenum was addressed by A. Masaliyev, first secretary of the Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee. Yu.A. Sklyarov, chief of the CPSU Central Committee Propaganda Department, took part in the plenum's work.

### Ukrainian Trade Union Council Holds Plenum

*AU010735 Kiev RADYANSKA UKRAINA in Ukrainian 26 Nov 87 p 3*

[RATAU report: "Trade Unions Should Pay Paramount Attention to the Social Sphere"]

[Excerpts] In 1988 allocations for consolidating the sociocultural sphere in the republic will exceed the 5-year targets by R1 billion. Such an increase is unprecedented in history. This fact was referred to at a plenum of the Ukrainian Trade Unions Council held in Kiev on 25 November. The participants in the plenum discussed the growing role of the republic's trade union organizations in providing working people with the necessary social and living conditions in light of the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the 18th USSR Trade Unions Congress.

A report was delivered by the V.A. Sologub, Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo member and Trade Unions Council chairman. [passage omitted]

In the adopted decision, the plenum mapped out concrete ways to settle impending problems in the social sphere.

Participating in the plenum proceedings were responsible functionaries of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, the Ukrainian Council of Ministers, the AUCCTU, and leaders of a number of the republic's ministries and departments.

### Major Fight in Taganrog Park Reported

PM080855 [Editorial Report] Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian on 27 November 1987 carries on page 1 under the headline "Look Truth Square in the Eye" a 1,100-word Rostov-na-Donu report by own correspondent Yu. Bespalov on discussions at the Rostov Komsomol Obkom plenum. Focusing on "negative phenomena among young people," the Komsomol Obkom first secretary noted that 70% of crimes in the oblast are committed by people under 30. Bespalov then goes on to detail a fight involving "several dozen people" that broke out in a Taganrog Park after a dance. It was only broken up by a "major detachment of militiamen and firemen using water cannon." Bespalov puts it down to "territorial divisions" among local youths. He also recounts how local university students managed to expel one of their fellows who had boasted that a place was waiting for him at the party raykom. He ends on an "optimistic note" by stating that the new Komsomol secretary was the most "approachable and sincere" of the candidates running in the election.

### Detective Cited on Prostitution Problem

*PM091305 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 4 Dec 87 Second Edition p 2*

[Unattributed report under the rubric "Yesterday: Events and Facts": "At a Main Internal Affairs Directorate Briefing"]

[Text] A routine meeting with journalists has been held at the Moscow Gorispolkom Main Internal Affairs Administration to discuss questions of organizing the struggle against prostitution in the capital.

Ye.T. Chaykovskiy, chief of Moscow's Criminal Investigation Department, addressed the journalists.

"More than 1,000 prostitutes have now been brought to light in the capital," Yevgeniy Tikhonovich said. "Half of them are young women aged between 18 and 25. The individuals we have arrested for prostitution include many students and technical college and vocational and technical school pupils, and we even encounter schoolgirls.

"As previously, in order to institute proceedings against a prostitute we have to catch her red-handed at the moment money changes hands. We do not have the right to enter apartments, where the most veritable brothels [pritony] are sometimes organized. Therefore, while not relaxing the entire package of measures in the struggle which internal affairs organs are waging, the Main Internal Affairs Administration is now turning for assistance to the public and to the labor collectives where these women work."

### New Service To Cover Moscow Happenings

*PM071611 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Dec 87 Morning Edition p 8*

[V. Belikhov report: "MOSTASS Reporting"]

[Text] The editorial teletypes have begun to receive news items marked "MOSTASS reports...". These reports have been prepared by a new TASS service—the Moscow information editorial office.

"Until recently," Yu. Buryak, chief of the editorial office, announced, "a small group of TASS journalists wrote about everything of note which had happened in the capital. MOSTASS's assignment is to report regularly on the city party organization's work experience in the new conditions of economic management and the acceleration of scientific and technical progress. We are planning to provide prompt accounts of how the city economy, transport, trade, and the services sphere are developing and about the outstanding events in Moscow's cultural life. Our reports are being sent to the mass media in the capital and the rest of the country.

### Soviet Law Court Anniversary Commemorated

*PM081031 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 5 Dec 87 p 1*

[TASS report: "In the People's Interests"]

[Text] The Soviet court is 70 years old. The foundations of the Soviet legal system were laid by the Soviet Government decree signed 5 December 1917. From the first days of its existence the Soviet court has firmly stood guard over the gains of the revolution and has steadily implemented Lenin's principles of socialist legality and law and order.

This was stated by the participants in a ceremonial meeting marking the 70th anniversary of the Soviet court. It was held in Moscow 4 December.

In the presidium were P.N. Demichev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; CPSU Central Committee Secretaries A.I. Lukyanov and G.P. Razumovskiy; V.P. Orlov, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; Yu.D. Maslyukov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; T.N. Menteshashvili, secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, ministry and department leaders, and representatives of the capital's public.

B.V. Kravtsov, USSR minister of justice, delivered a report. The implementation of the party's course toward the acceleration of socioeconomic development, he stressed, is inseparable from the consolidation of socialist legality and law and order, the safeguarding of citizens' constitutional rights and legitimate interests, and the strict observance of the principles of social justice. An important role is assigned to the Soviet courts in resolving these great and crucial tasks. The main avenue of their activity today is their readiness and ability to work under the conditions of expanding glasnost and democracy.

On the same day a meeting of veterans of the organs and institutions of justice and the courts was held at the USSR Ministry of Justice. A.I. Lukyanov warmly congratulated the participants on the notable date.

### RSFSR Deputy Premier Karpova Retires

*PM091437 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 9 Dec 87 First Edition p 2*

[Unattributed report: "In the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium"]

[Text] The RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has released Comrade Yevdokiya Fedorovna Karpova from her duties as deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers in connection with her retirement.

### World Muslim Congress Visit Ends

*LD290023 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1520 GMT 28 Nov 87*

[Text] Moscow, 28 Nov (TASS)—A delegation from the World Muslim Congress, which spent 10 days in the USSR at the invitation of the Islamic organizations of the USSR, has ended its visit. The delegation, headed by Dr Muhammad Ma'ruf al-Dawalibi, chairman of the World Muslim Congress, had the opportunity to learn of the life of their co-religionists in Moscow and Leningrad, as well as in such traditional areas for them as the Uzbek and Azerbaijan republics.

The leaders of the congress were present at public prayers in mosques, talked to representatives of the clergy and to believers, and got acquainted with monuments of Islamic architecture in Tashkent, Samurkand, and Baku.

The program of the Islamic delegation's visit included meetings not only with religious leaders, but also with public leaders and leaders of state. In particular, in Moscow they were received by Petr Demichev, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and by Yuliy Vorontsov, USSR first deputy minister of foreign affairs. Members of the delegation visited the USSR Council of Ministers council for Religious Affairs, the USSR ministry of Culture, and other establishments and organisations.

In a talk with journalists on the eve of the departure from Moscow, Dr al-Dawalibi noted that he was satisfied with the results of the visit. The head of the delegation underlined that he places great hopes on the impending Soviet-U.S. summit meeting.

Stating that he is a consistent advocate of dialogue, Dr al-Dawalibi expressed the conviction that peace cannot be built on fear. With today's level of arms, war cannot be waged: neither vanquished nor victors will remain on earth.

"We hope," he continued, "that during the talks between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan new steps will be taken toward reinforcing peace. The dreams of the peoples of the world about peace and security will find a path to implementation."

The chairman of the World Muslim Congress made particular mention of the realism and good sense of the Soviet leadership's new thinking. He added that he closely follows all the speeches by the Soviet leader, Mikhail Gorbachev, through press articles, and that he is reading his books.

On the subject of the Afghan problem, the religious and political figure from Saudi Arabia said that he believes in the sincerity of the Soviet government's intentions when it states that Soviet troops will be withdrawn from Afghanistan.

Muhammad Ma'ruf al-Dawalibi, who, in his own words, has had dealings with the Soviet Union over several decades by virtue of his political activities, pointed out that during his trip he saw that positive processes are underway in the USSR as regards freedom of worship. "I visited mosques, delivered sermons everywhere, and saw the joyful and open faces of Soviet Muslims. I am satisfied with what I saw," he said.

## Dissidents Prevented From Attending Seminar

*AU111539 Paris AFP in English 1518 GMT 11 Dec 87*

[Text] Moscow, Dec 11 (AFP)—About a dozen dissidents were prevented from reaching Moscow for the opening of an unofficial human rights seminar here Thursday marking U.N. Human Rights day, dissident sources said here Friday.

The seminar opened on Thursday in an apartment after organisers found a hall they had rented had been closed to be "disinfected".

One of the seminar organisers, Sergey Petrov, said that among those detained were a representative of the Crimean Tatars and the Ukrainian human rights activist Vassiliy Barladianou, who was being held in Odessa on the Black Sea.

Another dissident, Paruir Airikian, joint coordinator for the seminar section devoted to national minorities, had been arrested and released but was subsequently held up at Lvov in the Ukraine.

This section had now postponed its work until January, said Mr. Petrov, adding that the ecology section of the seminar had also been postponed because of intimidation against its members.

Mr. Petrov said the seminar had opened with a minute of silence in memory of Anatoliy Marchenko, who died in detention on December 8, 1986.

He said that foreigners attending the seminar included U.S. members of a Helsinki Accords surveillance group and the Czechoslovak Charter 77 movement as well as Swedish and U.S. observers from the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE).

Meanwhile Anatoliy Dubkov, one of the organisers of an authorised demonstration in Leningrad, who was arrested on Thursday for distributing pamphlets, has been sentenced to 15 days inmprisonment for "hooliganism", a Frankfurt-based international human rights society (IFGM) said Friday.

In Moscow on Friday Olivier Russbach, chairman of a Paris-based European association of lawyers and academics said he had made a written request to the chief prosecutor's office here asking for human rights measures adopted since Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev launched his "perestroyka" (restructuring) policy to be made public.

## Meet in Private Apartment

*AU140815 Paris AFP in English 0139 GMT 14 Dec 87*

[Text] Moscow, Dec 14 (AFP)—The Soviet authorities have again prevented the unofficial human rights seminar being held here since Thursday from holding debates at a rented hall, forcing the conferees to meet in a private apartment.

Some 60 people took part in Sunday's meeting, while eight seminar committees have been working in several Moscow apartments since the opening of the seminar in a private apartment on Thursday, organizer Lev Timofeyev said.

Mr. Timofeyev, chairman of the Glasnost press club, said on the opening day that officials had alerted him only hours before that the hall they had rented was closed to be "disinfected."

Foreigners attending the seminar include U.S. members of a Helsinki Accords surveillance group and Swedish and U.S. observers from the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE).

In Prague, Jan Urban, a member of Czechoslovakia's dissident Charter 77 human rights organization expressed satisfaction with his talks at the seminar, which he said included meetings with Soviet dissident Andrey Sakharov and his wife Yelena Bonner.

According to the Charter 77 official, Mr. Sakharov asked for "steady information on the repression in Czechoslovakia so as to be able to help."

"It is most important that the meeting was held and that Charter 77 was represented," Mr. Urban told AGENCE FRANCE-PRESSE at his return to Prague.

He said that "despite the little information available in the Soviet Union on the situation in Czechoslovakia" his organization's "moral prestige" there was "very big and unexpected."

Another Charter member, Venek Silhan, was to accompany Mr. Urban on his trip to Moscow Wednesday, but missed his plane after airport police detained him for several hours, Charter 77 sources said.

Mr. Silhan, the sources added, was questioned as a suspected member of "a valuable and precious metal smuggling net" and was told that he was henceforth banned from visiting the Soviet Union.

Mr. Silhan acted for then party leader Alexander Dubcek when the latter was held in Moscow during the crisis that led to the Warsaw Pact's military intervention in Czechoslovakia to end the Prague Spring political thaw.

## Book on Position of Orthodox Church Reviewed

*PM081555 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Dec 87 Second Edition p4*

[B. Zhirovov book review: "Comparison With the Past"]

[Text] A considerable number of scientific publications are devoted to the history of Russian Orthodoxy. But there has not really been any substantial work giving a general picture of its present state. The book under review—"Contemporary Russian Orthodoxy" ["Sovremennoye Russkoye Pravoslaviye"] by N.S. Gordiyenko, Lenizdat, 1987—fills this gap to a certain extent. It offers a detailed, critical analysis of the main aspects of Russian Orthodox ideology and practice on the threshold of its 1,000th anniversary.

The author focuses his main attention on elucidating from Marxist-Leninist positions the last 70 years in the history of the Russian Orthodox Church. This section of history is not examined in isolation but in comparison with the prerevolutionary past, which provides the opportunity to show the dynamics of development of religion and the church in socialist society, a development leading to an intensification and exacerbation of crisis phenomena throughout the religion-church complex.

Considerable changes have taken place in the social position of the Russian Orthodox Church throughout its existence in our society. The main point is that it is no longer the feudal church it once was, merely a state institution of the Russian Empire protecting the interests of the oppressors and living through the exploitation of the popular masses; it has become a voluntary union of believers, separate from the state and existing on donations. The church's sphere of influence has narrowed and the scale of its activity has likewise been reduced.

Unlike the Orthodoxy of prerevolutionary times and in the first post-October years, which took an openly antisocialist stand and refused to accept people's power, contemporary Russian Orthodoxy recognizes the socialist social and state system. It supports the domestic and foreign policy of the Soviet state.

The cultural revolution, which opened the doors to the treasures of world culture and science to millions of people, forced the church leadership to update many traditional religious views and rituals. However, this evolution has done nothing to change the philosophical essence of Russian Orthodox ideology, which is still unscientific and gives a distorted view of the world from an idealistic religious standpoint.

The very fact of these changes, unprecedented in the history of religion, is convincing evidence of the depth and radical nature of the socialist transformations which have even affected such a conservative organization as the church and prompted a process of modernization in it. This has resulted in the refutation of the basic premise of Russian Orthodox theology, namely that Orthodoxy is a "religion determined by God."

The book under review, which is addressed to the broad reading public, pursues counterpropaganda aims as well as cognitive and ideological educational aims. Drawing on a wealth of factual material, it exposes the slanderous fabrications of clerical-bourgeois anticommunist propaganda on alleged violations of freedom of conscience in the Soviet Union. In actual fact, there are no impediments to artificially constrain religious and church activity by Soviet believers.

It is another matter when we are talking about giving people philosophical assistance to correctly understand the world about them and act within it. The 27th CPSU Congress decisions orient us toward this kind of activity.

## Movie on Soviet History 'More Light' Reviewed

*PM021035 Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 21 Nov 87 p 4*

[APN correspondent I. Rudakova review under the rubric "Premiere": "More Light!"—first paragraph is MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA introduction]

[Text] The premiere of the historical documentary "...More Light!" ["Bolshe Sveta"] took place at the "Udarnik" Movie Theater. The APN correspondent's story covers this latest work by the Central Studio for Documentary Movies.

The movie "...More Light!" is, in experts' opinion, the most interesting of all the movies made by Soviet cinematography workers for the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. It is the work of scriptwriter I. Itskov and director M. Babak.

I. Itskov (he is known as one of the scriptwriters of the famous Soviet-U.S. series on World War II, "The Great Patriotic War") said that he took Lenin's words as the title of his new movie. The movie's makers see these words as expressing their creative creed: More light and truth and less gloss—anything to help present the history of the Land of the Soviets without distortions, without "blank spots." The onward advance of the world's first socialist state must be presented on screen in all its complexity and contradiction. "History," Itskov says, "is primarily about people; not only those who built and accomplished great deeds, but also those who essentially obstructed everything, at times even without realizing that the positions they upheld were incorrect."

"...More Light!" is, in professional parlance, a "montage movie," in other words a movie based on movie news material collected over the years. Babak and Itskov proved with their earlier works that they are able to find totally unknown material in archives and are capable of giving a new interpretation to what would seem to be textbook episodes, sometimes presenting them as paradoxes. As the movie's makers themselves admit, this time their task was not easy because the negative processes were bound to have affected documentary moviemaking: The archives contain loads of false and flattering movie news material clearly reflecting the methods of divergence between word and deed, ostentation, pomposity, endless fanfares, and ovations...

This movie by Babak and Itskov is a view of the history of the Land of the Soviets from 1987. Together with the audience, the movie's makers leaf through the pages of movie news material, seek and find in the methods of past years elements in harmony with today's arguments and discussions and the present renewal of Soviet life.

The movie opens in the first days after October. Here we have scenes depicting Lenin and a number of participants in the revolutionary events, including Trotskiy, Zinovyev, Bukharin, and Rykov; there is also documentary material showing the lively arguments about the Brest peace, its supporters and opponents.

The core of the movie lies in Lenin's idea that the Bolsheviks were always victorious through the creative development of Marxism; any retreat from this principle meant a defeat.

Thus, on the subject of the New Economic Policy, the authors—in their own words—felt it extremely important to reveal the essence of and historical need for the New Economic Policy, stressing not so much its negative aspects (as was the custom in the past) as the profoundly innovative content of the turnabout linked with Lenin's ideas.

The movie shows the complex dialectics of the cultural revolution in the twenties and thirties. We see Lunacharskiy, as well as rare footage showing Stanislavskiy, Bulgakov, Meyerkhold, Gorkiy, Mayakovskiy, Yesenin, Akhmatova, and many other eminent Soviet cultural figures.

Recounting the fate of the peasantry and the mistakes and excesses of collectivization, the movie's makers abandon the usual selection of footage, cliches, and symbols. Viewers perceive the fate of the country through the fate of individual persons like, for example, the family of Trifon Tvardovskiy, father of the outstanding Soviet poet.

Generally speaking, I got the feeling that the history shown in the movie is not just global. It also deals with daily routine, daily life, and changes in life. This is probably the reason behind the large number of expressive closeups. The faces of soldiers at the Smolnyy in the first few hours after October's victory, the faces of Muscovites crowding around the Sukharev Tower in the twenties, the first "ordinary," so to speak, audience members seated in the Bolshoy Theater's fashionable boxes, and peasants writing applications for admission to the kolkhoz. The builders of Magnitka and outstanding scientists; soldiers and marshals of the prewar years, including Blyukher, Tukhachevskiy, and Yegorov, who died during the period of personality cult. Movies made in the tragic year 1937 were discovered in the archives...

The movie's makers engage the audience in a complex and difficult discussion on the contradictory figure of Stalin (the movie contains little known, as well as hitherto unknown footage). The main idea running through this part of the movie is to offer an honest assessment of the complex phenomenon of the personality cult and to show how alien it is to democratic and revolutionary principles.

The part of the movie dealing with the Great Patriotic War centers on two dates—22 June 1941 and 9 May 1945. Itskov says: "Here we did not evade an analysis of the miscalculations and tragic mistakes, especially at the

initial stage of the war. After all, the greater the measure of truth, the more convincing is the narrative of the grandeur of our people's feat."

The authors admit that the depiction of the country's life in the seventies, when the stagnation trends started emerging, was extremely complex. "But analysis is very important here too," Itskov believes, "because all that is linked with the present, with unsolved and sometimes not fully understood problems. We strove to avoid bias or satire. But we could not have remained indifferent, either—everything is rather fresh in the memory and directly linked with today."

So we see how, even in those complex years, running ahead of their time, builders Zlobin and Travkin, physicians Ilizarov and Fedorov, Ivanovo Plant Director Kabaidze, writers Zalygin and Rasputin performed their civic duty...

Finally, the current episodes in the movie, when Leninist norms of social life began to be affirmed after the 27th CPSU Congress. We see the initial and still timid steps of restructuring, the process of democratization, the striving for irreversibility in the policy of glasnost.

The movie ends with a kind of "snapshot" of the Land of the Soviets: The faces of people—optimists and skeptics, young people and veterans, people of different nationalities leading different lives. These people's life is a continuation of the work which started in October 1917.

### Yevtushenko Explains Silence on Afghanistan

*PM021227 Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER in Swedish 26 Nov 87 p 4*

[Stefan Lindgren report: "Yevtushenko Lets His Afghanistan Poem Lie"]

[Excerpts] Yevgeniy Yevtushenko, the Soviet Union's leading unofficial cultural diplomat, has been visiting Sweden.

In the spirit of Joseph Brodsky the Swedish PEN Club had refused to receive him, but the Association of Writers was his host.

Yevtushenko certainly is an official writer. Dissidents are pleased to remind you how he hid in the Historical Museum in Moscow while others demonstrated in Red Square against the Sinyavskiy-Daniel trials.

Yevtushenko has chosen to be an official writer and to play by the rules.

But even within that framework there is a yawning gulf between decency and baseness. For example, Yevtushenko has had the courage to attack anti-Semitism and defend the Crimean Tatars. [Passage omitted]

During his visit to Sweden I took the opportunity of asking Yevtushenko why he had not raised the subject of the war in Afghanistan.

"I have actually written a poem about Afghanistan," he replied, "a powerful poem that I wrote a few years ago, about a Russian soldier. The first stanza runs:

"'A Russian boy lies on the Afghan earth.

"'An ant, Mussulman creeps on his cheek.'

"You know, it has been difficult to print this poem, perhaps it still is. I have only read it to my closest friends. Believe me, this is not because of cowardice. If I start to read this poem and it begins to circulate, it will eventually end up in the West, and then I'll hear it on VOA complete with speculative political commentaries. That is something that I do not want. Just think yourself into the situation. A poet who has a good poem in his desk drawer and cannot publish it. For I know that these damned mass media would immediately use it for political speculation.

"I want our boys to get out of there as soon as possible, but I am no professional politician. This is something that can only happen in one way, and that is for the Western powers to guarantee that there will be no bloodbath after the Soviet Union has withdrawn. There is no need to determine who is responsible for this war, as long as it is brought to an end.

"I would like to go there, but I am afraid that my presence could be exploited in the wrong way."

So Yevtushenko's admirers in the West have been given a stanza to chew on. Sufficient?

## Agricultural

### Livestock Farmers Near to Fulfilling Plan

*LD091830 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 9 Dec 87*

[Text] The USSR State Committee for Statistics reports that the country's livestock farmers are near to fulfilling the plan for sales of meat and milk to the state. Over 20 million tonnes of livestock and poultry have been procured on farms, which is 99.7% of the plan. Almost 70 million tonnes of milk has been procured, 99%. Compared to last year, the increase in meat is over 1.5 million tonnes, and in milk 2,207,000 tonnes. Over the country as a whole, the plan for procurements of eggs and wool has been over-fulfilled. Farms in the Ukraine, Belorussia, Latvia and Armenia have successfully coped with supplies of meat, and Belorussia, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Kirghiziya and Turkmenistan with supplies of milk.

These figures indicate that the workers of the country's agro-industrial complex are continuing to increase production of livestock produce. However, there are still

many shortcomings where procurement and especially processing of livestock produce is concerned; this leads to the population still getting incomplete and irregular supplies of meat and dairy produce.

### Estonian Agro-Industry To Initiate Autonomy

*LD070110 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 6 Dec 87*

[Text] [Announcer] The whole of the Estonian agro-industrial complex will be the first to go over to financial autonomy. Here is an interview given to our correspondent by Georgiy Vasilyevich Aleshin, second secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee.

[Begin recording] [Aleshin] Next year, 60% of all of our enterprises...

[Unidentified correspondent, interrupting] Of the country?

[Aleshin]..of the country will be transferred to financial autonomy, self-financing, and self-recouping. The state agro-industrial complex has been reborn in Estonia, and of course we are pioneers in this and we must carry on this pioneering work, all the more since today restructuring means first and foremost the search for new ways.

The majority of kolkhozes and sovkhozes of the Estonian Republic are, in the main, working on financial autonomy. Now, as they say, this has to be transferred to the whole of the republic. So now we will be working toward this, so that we transfer to this system of management from the first of the month. What does this hold in store for us? Well, first of all, we shall see who is who under this system. That is, today the subsidies that are given to farming are sometimes shared out according to the principle of equal measure for all. Now, we shall be able, based on the new conditions, to distribute, or redistribute, these funds so that they provide the greatest returns. If rayons or kolkhozes and sovkhozes have difficult natural or weather conditions and so on, they can be given more or less equal conditions compared with those who have both better performance and better conditions, better supply of power equipment, and so on.

[Correspondent] But won't it turn out that the front-rankers will be in worse financial conditions, with all their profits being transferred to the fund for those lagging behind?

[Aleshin] No, because the differential system will be made such that everyone has an interest in gaining the best final results. Financial autonomy is intended to enhance our economic and financial results, and most importantly to gain the greatest final returns. I will say that the workers in agriculture have received this news very positively, concerning the whole of the republic's agriculture going over to financial autonomy. Naturally, we are faced with task of all of us putting our work in order, and eliminating superfluous levels of management, so that the agro-industrial committee really turns into a body guiding the whole of the agro-industrial complex, and so that it doesn't just write directives, but is also a good adviser and a good helper in all new things. [end recording]

### Media Report 2-11 December Developments

LD120520 [Editorial Report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian, unless otherwise indicated, on 2-11 December. GMT times of broadcasts are given in parentheses at the end of each item.

2 December

The cotton harvest is continuing in some places in Uzbekistan, notably the Fergana Valley. Heavy rains and low temperatures in spring meant that 400,000 hectares had to be resown, and then there was snow just when the harvest was due to start. The weather has never before caused so many problems for the Uzbek cotton harvest. Around 2 million people were brought from the towns to the cotton fields to help with the harvest. Bukhara Oblast, however, has produced 105,000 tonnes of cotton more than last year when conditions were comparatively favorable, thanks to good work by machine operators. Indifferent work by land improvers on the cotton fields and failure to rotate crops properly also have contributed to problems with the harvest. Recently, the country's planning organs finally accepted the request of cotton growers in Uzbekistan and reduced the plan for raw cotton procurement by 500,000 tonnes in 1988. That was done in view of the real capabilities of the republic. By the end of the 5-year plan, it is planned that the republic basically will have finished the transition to a scientifically grounded crop-rotation system. Machines must be used much more extensively in harvest work and it is time for farm bosses to change their attitude to this immediately and fundamentally. (0349)

Cotton picking in Surkhandarya, Bukhara, and Khorezma Oblasts is ending. The amount of cotton picked has reached about 4.84 million tonnes. (1430)

3 December

Moldavia's livestock farmers fulfilled the 2-yçar plan for farm output sales to the state by 20 November. (0500)

4 December

More than 20 rayons in Uzbekistan are today conducting above-plan sales of cotton to the state. Fergana Valley farms are delivering up to 5,000 tonnes of cotton to procurement stations daily. Plowing is getting underway on land where cotton has been harvested. To date almost 1 million hectares have been plowed in the republic. (0304)

Farmers in Tajikistan have fulfilled the year's targets for production and marketing of vegetables. More than 320,000 tonnes of various vegetables were dispatched to the trade network and processing facilities. (0500)

5 December

Rostov Oblast: 3.1 million tonnes of grain crops have been dispatched to reception centers. This is the annual assignment, and is the first time the oblast has fulfilled the plan for grain crop sales since 1978. (0304)

The cottongrowers of Osh Oblast, Kirghizia, have completed the annual plan for the sale of raw cotton to the state. (0700)

6 December

The farmers of Zaporozhye Oblast have fulfilled the plan for grain crop sales to the state. More than 1.2 million tonnes of grain crops have been delivered to grain reception points and elevators. (0000)

Tajik SSR: About 190,000 hectares of land have been sown with winter wheat and barley to date. (0304)

9 December

Uzbek SSR: To date autumn plowing has been carried out on 1.5 million hectares.

11 December

Kirghizia's crop growers have fulfilled their obligations for the delivery of cotton to the state. Almost 73,000 metric tons of this valuable raw material have been delivered to processing enterprises. This is over 104% of the task. As had been planned, the cotton growers have settled last year's debts. Despite the difficult weather conditions, many farms have grown a plentiful harvest: 30 and more quintals of raw cotton have been obtained on average. (1430)

**Briefs:**

### Snow Hampers Cotton Harvest

The tension at the country's cottonfields is not abating. According to Yuriy Necheslavovich Renetovskiy, head of the cotton production subdepartment of the USSR Gosagroprom, as of today more than 7 million tonnes of raw cotton have been put in store. The plan has so far been fulfilled by 83%. The soil is, as before, oversaturated following heavy snowfalls and snow melting. This does not allow for the use of machinery. All works in the fields are carried out basically manually. Difficulties are arising in processing harvested raw material too, because of its increased humidity. All resources have been mobilized in cotton-sowing republics, both in Central Asia and in Azerbaijan, so that it will be possible to sell to the state the maximum quantity of raw materials for light industry even under these conditions. [Text] [*Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0100 GMT 13 Nov 87 LD*]

## Scientific

### 'Cosmos-1900' Satellite Launched 12 Dec

*LD121420 Moscow TASS in English 1416 GMT 12 Dec 87*

["Cosmos-1900 in Flight"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow December 12 TASS—The Soviet Union today launched another satellite in the Cosmos series.

The satellite carries scientific equipment to continue outer space exploration.

It was placed in an orbit with the following parameters:

Initial period of revolution - 89.8 minutes,

Maximum distance from earth (apogee) - 287 kilometers,

Minimum distance (perigee) - 263 kilometers,

Inclination - 65 degrees.

Apart from the scientific equipment, the satellite carries a radio system for taking precise measurements of the orbit's parameters and a radio telemetry system for beaming data about the operation of the instruments and equipment back to earth.

The on-board equipment is functioning normally.

A coordinating-and-computing center is processing incoming information.

### Mir 'Proceeding Normally'; Cosmonauts 'Well'

*LD111330 Moscow TASS in English 1205 GMT 11 Dec 87*

[Text] Moscow December 11 TASS—By a TASS correspondent from the Mission Control Centre:

The Soviet cosmonauts Yuriy Romanenko and Aleksandr Aleksandrov are completing their latest week in space orbit on board the manned complex Mir.

The programme of the crew's work in the past days included astrophysical and medical-biological studies, photography of some areas in the Soviet Union's territory in the southern latitudes.

In the course of the orbital endurance flight, medical checkups are regularly held to evaluate the state of health of the crew and predict their work capacity. Today's plan

provides for an examination of the cosmonaut's cardiovascular system in the course of physical jerks [as received—probably "load"] on veloergometer, and a number of biochemical studies.

In the course of the day, the crew will also carry out a series of experiments with the use of equipment maria, continue unloading the automatic transport spaceship Progress-33.

Tomorrow Yuriy Romanenko and Aleksandr Aleksandrov will have a day-off. They will carry out a training session in pressure suit chibis [as received] and meet with their families in the course of communication sessions.

Both cosmonauts fell well.

The flight of the research complex Mir is proceeding normally.

### Leaders Sign Polar Explorer's Obituary

*PM081403 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Dec 87 Morning Edition p 2*

[Obituary of Ye.I. Tolstikov]

[Excerpts] On 3 December 1987 the well-known Soviet polar explorer Yevgeniy Ivanovich Tolstikov, member of the CPSU, hero of the Soviet Union, and doctor of geographical sciences, died in his 75th year after a serious, protracted illness. [passage omitted]

M.S Gorbachev, V.I. Vorotnikov, A.A. Gromyko, L.N. Zaykov, Ye.K. Ligachev, V.P. Nikonov, N.I. Ryzhkov, N.N. Slyunkov, M.S. Solomentsev, V.M. Chebrikov, E.A. Shevardnadze, V.V. Shcherbitskiy, A.N. Yakovlev, P.N. Demichev, V.I. Dolgikh, Yu.F. Solovev, N.V. Talyzin, D.T. Yazov, A.P. Biryukova, A.F. Dobrynin, A.I. Lukyanov, V.A. Medvedev, G.P. Razumovskiy, I.V. Kapitonov, G.I. Marchuk, Yu.A. Izrael, V.A. Grigorev, A.N. Volkov, Yu.M. Volmer, N.I. Kotlyar, Ye.A. Kozlovskiy, V.R. Yashchenko, A.F. Treshnikov, M.I. Shevelev, I.P. Mazuruk, B.A. Krutskikh, Ye.S. Korotkevich, N.A. Kornilov, and A.N. Chilingarov.

## Military

### Yazov on INF Treaty, Boosting Combat Readiness

*PM131615 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 Dec 87 Second Edition p 1*

[Report by correspondent Colonel N. Kalmykov: "Continuing Glory in Present-Day Actions"]

[Excerpts] The Moscow Higher Combined-Arms Command Academy named for the RSFSR Supreme Soviet is 70 years old. [passage omitted]

V.P. Orlov, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; Army General D.S. Sukhorukov, USSR deputy minister of defense for cadres; other military leaders; veteran graduates of the Kremlin academy; and representatives of labor collectives and youth organizations came to the academy to congratulate the students and command, political, and teaching personnel on the jubilee. [passage omitted]

In the evening a ceremonial meeting of representatives of Moscow city and oblast working people and servicemen from the Moscow garrison was held in the RSFSR House of Unions to mark the academy's 70th anniversary. The meeting presidium included Army General D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of defense; V.P. Orlov, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; Army General A.D. Lizichev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate; Army General D.S. Sukhorukov, USSR deputy minister of defense for cadres; Colonel General M.D. Popkov, member of the Military Council and chief of the Ground Forces Political Directorate; N.I. Shlyaga, sector chief in the CPSU Central Committee Administrative Organs Department; Colonel General V.M. Arkhipov, commander of the Moscow Military District; Lieutenant General A.I. Makunin, member of the Military Council and chief of the Moscow Military District Political Directorate; and generals, officers, Kremlin academy veterans, and working people's representatives. [passage omitted]

Army General D.T. Yazov, USSR minister of defense, addressed the meeting. He warmly congratulated the students, command and teaching personnel, and all alumni of the academy on the noteworthy jubilee and wished them success in propagandizing the glorious revolutionary and combat traditions of the Soviet Armed Forces and in training skilled military cadres. The Soviet people, the minister of defense stressed, have always revered the name of Kremlin academy students, with whose name our people link their image of our army as the defender of their vital interests.

We are celebrating the academy's jubilee at an unforgettable and dynamic time, the defense minister went on. Restructuring is accelerating and has become an irreversible process. The Armed Forces are also immersed in restructuring. We are entering a new stage of it. Paramount importance is now attached to concrete action and concrete results. The party has firmly stated: Enough loud words and assurances: What is needed is more diligence and responsibility. There is a need for concrete decisions and concrete results in every sector of work and all spheres of life and activity.

The first results are already at hand. The intensive work to further enhance the vigilance and combat readiness of troops and naval forces, improve the style and methods of troop leadership, and radically strengthen military discipline is bearing fruit. An example of this is the

results of combat and political training and of the socialist competition in honor of the 70th anniversary of Great October, the increase in the number of rated specialists and of subunits with an "excellent" and "good" rating, and the trend toward reduction in violations of military discipline.

But there are still many problems. What has been achieved represents only the first shoots of restructuring. There is a need for stronger shoots. We link particular hopes to our military education system, which is called upon to strengthen the Armed Forces officer corps so that it matches all requirements of restructuring. The task is to raise the training and education process to a new qualitative level and strengthen its link with troops' lives. The effectiveness of the students' political, military, and moral education must be increased as well.

Recalling that he had spelled out in detail the tasks facing the military education system during his visit to the academy on the eve of the training year, the defense minister told the students:

Absorb as an example the courage and staunchness of previous generations of Kremlin academy graduates. Like they did, learn to love the motherland heartachingly and to accept any trials for the sake of the great objectives of the Communist Party, the Soviet people, and our beautiful socialist fatherland.

Today you are a student, but tomorrow you will be a commanding officer. It is therefore today, now, that you must prepare seriously and intensively for this great mission of yours. A commanding officer combines will and a party character, energy and professionalism, and bears the prime responsibility for defending the motherland. By virtue of your soul, your duty, and your vocation, not stinting effort and not sparing yourself, persistently master military and political knowledge, temper the steel of your character and your muscles, and learn to obey and be obeyed. Preserve and augment the revolutionary and combat traditions of the Soviet Army.

The general line of Soviet foreign policy remains invariable: It consists of struggling for peace and the prevention of war. The Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles, which has been signed, is an important achievement along the path of eliminating the nuclear threat. It constitutes a tremendous political victory for our party and an important success for the new thinking.

However, the situation in the world remains complex and tense through the fault of bellicose imperialist circles. They wisn to smash military-strategic parity at any price and achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union. The CPSU Central Committee and the Soviet Government are doing everything necessary to safeguard the security of the USSR and our friends and allies. Socialism and peace are indivisible.

This is why it is necessary to continue to increase vigilance and combat readiness, strengthen discipline, raise the troops' political and moral state to a new level, and display tireless concern for the technical equipping of the Army and Navy and the improvement of control. The party counts firmly on military cadres in resolving the tasks of strengthening the country's defense capability. Soviet people's confidence in our military might must be unshakable.

In conclusion, Army General D.T. Tazov expressed firm confidence that the students and command, political, and teaching personnel will continue to augment the academy's glorious traditions through their selfless labor. He expressed confidence that they would devote all their knowledge, energy, and ability to the cause of defending the gains of Great October and will worthily greet the 70th anniversary of the Soviet Armed Forces and the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference with real results in restructuring.

After the ceremonial meeting, a concert was given for its participants.

## Higher Military Construction Schools Viewed

OW121333 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2155 GMT on 11 December presents a 30-minute documentary, "Creation Is the Vocation," devoted to a review of Soviet higher military construction schools. As video shows a launch of a missiles, a MIG-29 aircraft, a BMP-2, view of naval destroyers and submarines, and construction cites, a narrator talks about the importance of the profession of military builders. Video then shows a poster bearing names of several higher military construction schools and a heap of Komsomol membership cards, as the narrator speaks about political demands faced by graduates of these schools. Video cuts to show a map of maneuvers, the maneuvers taking place, and physical training of a school's students, and then shows a map of the USSR with cities having such schools: Gorkiy, Kamyshin, Leningrad, Tallinn, Tolyatti, and Pushkin.

Video cuts to show the Army General Komarovskiy Leningrad Higher Military Construction School, the Order of the Red Banner awarded, and a school graduate, Colonel Dmitriyev, giving an outline of the school's history, and the narrator talks about high quality of the professorial personnel and the students' military scientific society which functions there. While he speaks the video shows students at classes, laboratories, a training mechanical shop, field construction work, and military tactical maneuvers.

Then Colonel Usov, a graduate of Pushkin School, outlines the history of that school, and the narrator lauds the school's achievements; video shows training equipment, while the narrator says that there is "laser and computing equipment in the school." Video then shows classes and training ground. The narrator says that the three schools for officers are located on the Volga, that is, in Kamyshin, Gorkiy, and Tolyatti. Video cuts to show classes at Kamyshin school, maneuvers, driving classes, earth moving equipment, more classes, and training. Video then shows classes of ideological struggle at Gorkiy School, other classes, hobby club, dormitory, students marching.

Narrator says that political workers are no less important; video shows classes at Simferopol Higher Political School, construction field work, meeting with high school students of an officer of the school. Video then cuts to show Tallinn Higher Political School, classes; the narrator says that protection against mass-destruction weapons is studied. Video cuts to show construction field work; the film ends with video showing a graduation ceremony at one of the schools.